

JOINT COMMISSION ON UNIFICATION

OF THE

Methodist Episcopal Church

AND THE

Methodist Episcopal
Church, South

VOLUME II

Proceedings at Savannah, Ga.
January 23-February
6, 1918

PUBLISHING HOUSE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH
NASHVILLE DALLAS RICHMOND

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN
NEW YORK CHICAGO CINCINNATI

COPYRIGHT, 1920
BY
THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN
AND
SMITH & LAMAR

The proceedings of the third meeting of the Joint Commission have been compiled from the official minutes and from the stenographic report of the speeches as revised by each speaker.

A. W. HARRIS,
FRANK M. THOMAS,
Secretaries.

May 1, 1918.

COMMISSION ON UNIFICATION OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH

BISHOPS

Earl Cranston, Washington, D. C.
John W. Hamilton, Washington, D. C.
William F. McDowell, Washington, D. C.
Frederick D. Leete, Atlanta, Ga.
Richard J. Cooke, Helena, Mont.

MINISTERS

Edgar Blake, Chicago, Ill.
David G. Downey, New York, N. Y.
John F. Goucher, Baltimore, Md.
Robert E. Jones, New Orleans, La.
Albert J. Nast, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Frank Neff, Hutchinson, Kans.
Edwin M. Randall, Everett, Wash.
Claudius B. Spencer, Kansas City, Mo.
Joseph W. Van Cleve, Chicago, Ill.
John J. Wallace, Pittsburgh, Pa.

LAYMEN

George Warren Brown, St. Louis, Mo.
Charles W. Fairbanks, Indianapolis, Ind.
Abram W. Harris, Secretary, New York, N. Y.
Charles W. Kinne, Jacksonville, Fla.
Irvine G. Penn, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Ira E. Robinson, Charleston, W. Va.
Henry Wade Rogers, New York, N. Y.
William Rule, Knoxville, Tenn.
Alexander Simpson, Jr., Philadelphia, Pa.
Rolla V. Watt, San Francisco, Cal.

COMMISSION ON UNIFICATION OF THE METHOD- IST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH

BISHOPS

Warren A. Candler, Atlanta, Ga.
E. E. Hoss, Muskogee, Okla.
Collins Denny, Richmond, Va.
Edwin D. Mouzon, Dallas, Tex.
W. B. Murrah, Memphis, Tenn.

MINISTERS

Frank M. Thomas, Secretary, Louisville, Ky.
W. J. Young, Atlanta, Ga.
John M. Moore, Nashville, Tenn.
C. M. Bishop, Georgetown, Tex.
E. B. Chappell, Nashville, Tenn.
T. N. Ivey, Nashville, Tenn.
A. F. Watkins, Jackson, Miss.
H. M. Du Bose, Nashville, Tenn.
W. N. Ainsworth, Savannah, Ga.
A. J. Lamar, Nashville, Tenn.

LAYMEN

M. L. Walton, Woodstock, Va.
H. N. Snyder, Spartanburg, S. C.
P. D. Maddin, Nashville, Tenn.
R. S. Hyer, Dallas, Tex.
J. H. Reynolds, Conway, Ark.
R. E. Blackwell, Ashland, Va.
T. D. Samford, Opelika, Ala.
J. R. Pepper, Memphis, Tenn.
E. C. Reeves, Johnson City, Tenn.
H. H. White, Alexandria, La.

RESERVE MEMBERS

Methodist Episcopal Church

Bishop Luther B. Wilson, New York, N. Y.
Rev. Charles M. Stuart, D.D., Evanston, Ill.
James R. Joy, New York, N. Y.
Charles A. Pollock, Fargo, N. Dak.

Methodist Episcopal Church, South

Bishop James Atkins, Waynesville, N. C.
Rev. W. Asbury Christian, Richmond, Va.
Rev. E. V. Regester, Alexandria, Va.
Rev. C. H. Briggs, Springfield, Mo.
Edward W. Hines, Louisville, Ky.
G. T. Fitzhugh, Memphis, Tenn.

PROCEEDINGS AT SAVANNAH, GA.
JANUARY 23-FEBRUARY 6, 1918

FIRST DAY, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1918.

THE Joint Commission met in the Sunday school room of the Independent Presbyterian Church and was called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Earl Cranston.

The hymn, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty," was sung.

Dr. A. J. Lamar read Corinthians xii.

The hymn, "Nearer, my God, to thee," was sung, after which Dr. Lamar offered prayer.

The hymn, "My country, 'tis of thee," was sung.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I recognize Dr. Ainsworth.

W. N. Ainsworth: The Methodists of Savannah are delighted to welcome you gentlemen of the Commission to our city. This city, the scene of John Wesley's American labors and in which our great founder himself said that Methodism had its second rise, is rich in historic interest. It is our great pleasure to welcome this Commission, which means so much to the future progress of Methodism, to this city, and we wish to show our appreciation of your presence here by being your servants for Christ's sake. If we have not anticipated all your needs by providing everything desired for your comfort and pleasure, you have only to let such new need be known, and we shall supply it immediately if we can. I shall not detain you further with words of welcome, but we hope to show our appreciation of your presence by our service in Christ's name. The Rev. Neal L. Anderson, the pastor of this Church, is present; and I desire to introduce him.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): We shall be delighted to hear Dr. Anderson.

Rev. Neal L. Anderson, pastor of the Independent Presbyterian Church, was introduced by Dr. Ainsworth.

Dr. Anderson said: I count it a privilege at this opening session of the councils of your two Commissions to welcome you to Savannah in the name of the Presbyterians of the city. As a congregation the Independent Presbyterian Church rejoices in the fellowship of its brethren which has marked its history. In the latter part of the eighteenth century, when our first building was destroyed by fire, we were housed with our Baptist brethren for several years. When our beautiful first building erected on this corner was destroyed by the flames, every Protestant church in the city was thrown open to our people, and we found a temporary home back in the old neighborhood of our first church, with the brethren of the Methodist Episcopal

Church on St. James Square. So we are peculiarly glad in reciprocating the courtesy of other days to welcome you brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church, North and South, to our church home and wish to assure you of our prayerful interest in the great problems you are facing in this trying hour of world history. The thing that perhaps impressed me most when I came to Savannah a few months ago was the spirit of fellowship among God's people. I went almost first of all to the old historic Christ Church and was impressed with this spirit as I read those two tablets on its walls, one to John Wesley, Priest of the Church of England, founder of Methodism, and the other to George Whitefield, Priest of the Church of England, flaming evangel of the grace of God, claimed rightly by Methodists, Presbyterians, and Calvinists the world over. Savannah occupies a very unique position in relation to the four great movements that characterize and have revolutionized the modern world—philanthropy, Sunday schools, evangelism, and missions. It was here that George Whitefield and Lady Huntingdon began a new era in Christian philanthropy in the Western world, when they founded the Bethesda Orphanage. "Here," says the "Encyclopedia Britannica," "fifty years before Robert Raikes's school in London, was gathered the first Sunday school in the world. Here the great evangelistic movement that has transformed the world was born in the hearts of the two Wesleys and George Whitefield; and in this city was composed the tune to the greatest of missionary hymns, "From Greenland's Icy Mountains," whose inspiring strains were sung for the first time on this very spot in which you are gathered, by the congregation of the Independent Presbyterian Church, led by their organist, the great composer, Lowell Mason. Is it too much to say that no other city can claim such intimate relationships to beginnings of these four great movements within the kingdom of God, and that no other city has more intimate associations with the great Church which you represent at this critical moment in your history? On behalf of my people, I welcome you to this building as your place of meeting. If there is anything we can do for you that has not been done, call upon us. The janitor, the buildings, the Church and Bible schools, the manse in the rear of the Church—all we have are at your disposal. Rejoicing in the unity of the holy catholic Church, we can only seek for you in your councils the guidance in all your deliberations of the great Head of the Church, our Lord Jesus Christ.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): On behalf of my brethren, let me say that, while the Commission will doubtless later make formal expression of its thanks for the use of this building, it is quite proper for me to say now for them that we are de-

lighted to be in Savannah. Some of us at least, for the first time, become acquainted with some of the incidents that make our presence here at this time singularly fitting. The only trouble is: I suppose this Church is of Scotch origin?

Dr. Anderson: Yes.

Bishop Cranston: It may be a question if these two great Commissions of the Methodist Churches—soon to be one, God willing—are meeting on neutral ground when they are in a Scotch Presbyterian Church, since Scotch Presbyterianism was never known to be neutral on anything; and yet, Dr. Anderson, the quality of your love is impartial, and we greatly appreciate your kindness, and the remarks you have made have brought us at once into a spiritual atmosphere. And now, brethren, I feel inclined to take advantage of my years—I believe I am the patriarch of the Commission—to remind you of the seriousness of the matters which we have in hand. I think we all carry a conviction that we have come to our last opportunity in this generation for the accomplishment of the mission in which we represent two sister Churches which for forty years have been seeking nearer approach to each other. I would that we might at the very outset find ourselves in the spirit of our meeting at Baltimore. We all must have regretted the tendency on the part of some of those who have written for the public press, especially our Methodist press, to again lower the motive of our deliberations to the plane of barter and gain. Too much has been said, it seems to me, since we last met about what one Church would have to surrender and what the other Church would thereby gain. What the extremists on one side have said, and then what the extremists on the other side have answered, have gradually and imperceptibly created in some quarters an atmosphere which is not favorable to spiritual discernment and cannot possibly contribute to the success of our negotiations. We know that no man in this body is seeking to take advantage of his brother. Neither Commission has the spirit of aggrandizement. There is no Hindenburg program in either of these Commissions. We realize that we are grappling with a problem too great for the wisdom of man, but we do not believe it is too hard for the wisdom of God. Our task is altogether beyond the compass of man's shrewdness or diplomatic skill. Defying the most persuasive eloquence, it is only in the presence of God that our differences may disappear in a happy solution. But if, through the indulgence of human motives and aims, we go away from here in confusion—which God forbid—what shall we say to the Church, what shall we say to the nation? What shall we say to the world if we fail here in such a mission at such a time as this? Let us breathe again the inspiration we have felt in trying to read the heart of God. Most

of us have come to believe that with this great movement he is beginning the realization, in a most significant and marvelous way, of the dream of humanity—the brotherhood of the race and the sisterhood of the nations. O brethren, if we Methodists, akin in every aim that ought to control human conviction and determine human action—I mean matters of conscience, matters of holy faith, matters of devout anticipation—if we Methodists shall not be obedient to the Heavenly vision, how shall we help a world in eclipse? We are called to give the first telling answer to the demand that Christianity redeem itself from the stigma placed upon it by the attitude of the Christian nations in the opening of this war. We have here the chance to strike the bells that hang yonder above us in the heavens, to which all eyes and ears are turned, and send out to the world the ringing tones of hope. I have been trying to cultivate the spirit of a commissioner sent to do the work of God. I hope we all are ready to recognize ourselves as God's commissioners, rather than as commissioners of one Church or the other. It becomes us to bear in mind how we came to this hour. To me there is much in the thought that I am here, not to speak for myself, not to represent any special personal conviction which I may have indulged in the past, not to press for the sentiment of the men who may have talked to me yesterday—I am here to represent the spirit of mutual confidence and unification. Every man here, it seems to me, ought to accept as his ruling thought that these two great bodies of Methodists are trying to find their way into each other's hearts to the end that they may better do the work of God and more consistently preach the gospel of reconciliation. May I remind you that the points we are to deal with here are not the fundamentals upon which the Church rests? May I remind you that the Church of Jesus Christ is a spiritual body and that the ecclesiastical paraphernalia about which we are tempted to talk so much, and these institutions about which we are greatly concerned, are simply changeable accessories? Let us not over-emphasize them in their relation to our main problem. Doubtless many of our estimates of the values involved will bear revision. Pardon me. I could not resist saying these things to you. I would rather God would call me home than to go forward to the day when this meeting adjourns with no message to divided Churches, no answer to the world, no cry for unity; with the Churches still apart, and Methodism sending forth no practical protest against the unseemly contentions of God's children. We are learning in bitter experience the fearful cost of war. Have not our Churches wasted long enough spiritual resources and money needed in the conflict with evil? It is enough to make us long for the land where our fathers are at peace,

where all these dissensions and divisions are measured in their absolute littleness, and where the victory song is one.

John M. Moore: Mr. Chairman, with your permission, I would like to say a word. I do not think our National Government would long keep a man in the leadership of our armies in France who had lost his hope of victory. I do not think that any man would be sent to lead our armies who did not have some expectation of victory. I do not think the Church can go forward unless its leadership shall have the attitude of success. I have interpreted my commission, as a member of this body, seriously. I believe that my Church meant that I should come and do my work in this Commission faithfully, earnestly, and untiringly until I have exhausted every means possible to carry out its expressed will, which was to consummate a plan of unification in accordance with certain great principles embodied in the Chattanooga suggestion. I do not think there is any reason why any of us should maintain the attitude of pessimism. Some of the brethren speak of me sometimes as the optimist. Certainly I am, and why should I not be? If I were opposed to the consummation of this movement, I certainly would take a pessimistic attitude. If I wanted to do everything possible to defeat the work of this Commission, then I would say to everybody: "We cannot come together on the negro question." If I wanted to disband this organization and go back to the Conferences and say that nothing can be done, then would I make much of the troubles in the Regional Conference system. But I am not one of those who want to disobey the orders of my General Conference. I want to exhaust every means at my command and every thought that my mind is capable of bringing forth in order to the consummation of a plan of unification that is righteous, that is sane, that is reasonable, that is defensible, that is acceptable to my Church and to the other Church that I love also. I have been praying about this matter ever since I became a member of this Commission. I believe that God is leading us. Although we have had discussions in some papers which were for the dissipation of all our efforts toward unification, yet we must not stop with those things. Much of that is the play of the enemy. Men have said, "I am in favor of this, that, and the other plan," when down in the bottom of their hearts there was the secret desire to destroy all plans and to defeat any movement whatsoever. A man who is not a member of this Commission said to me this morning: "You men need to stand strong. You have the ability to consummate that plan of unification here in this room before you close, and the Church is expecting you to make report of a consummated plan when you come to the General Conference. You make out the plan and leave it to the General Conference as to what they will do with it. Exhaust

yourselves in this matter and then let the Church act." I believe God is leading us, and I believe this matter is to be consummated before we leave this city. I have the utmost confidence in what is now being done. I believe we have laid the platform and erected the great walls of the building, and that before we leave we may be able to conclude the other matters and go to our General Conference with a consummated plan. Brethren, we are not going to do this by our going around saying, "We can't do this. I am afraid Brother So-and-So will defeat it if we bring it to the General Conference; and then, if we get it through the General Conference, the Annual Conferences will defeat it." Let the future take care of its troubles while we devote ourselves to the task at hand. God knows I shall do my utmost to perform the service my Church expects of me at this time.

Bishop Leete: I would like to add a word to this splendid optimistic utterance of Dr. Moore. On both sides we are one on this matter of desirability of unification. I am certain he is correct in saying that God is leading us. If I did not believe that, I would want to withdraw from any branch of Methodism and get somewhere where God would lead. My thought is that not only is God leading us, but I believe he will continue to lead us in whatever we do. I believe also we have before us a marvelous opportunity. We are not to consider ourselves in any sense defeated, no matter what the outcome of the events of these few days' deliberations is. I wish I were a prophet, as Dr. Moore is.

John M. Moore: You are.

Bishop Leete: Maybe I am; but I only followed you afar off in that grand and cheerful outline you have given us, and yet I have no question whatever of the possibility of closing a definite plan here. But what I rose to say is that, without any prophecy one way or the other, it is my confidence—and I hope we shall hold this firm in our hearts—that, whether or not we succeed right now in getting to a plan that we can unitedly maintain, God is leading us. And we are not to feel otherwise. If by any chance any of the hopes of our hearts are not realized, if at the conclusion of our negotiations here we have not arrived at what we hope to reach, still I think we must maintain our conviction that God is leading us into that great unity of spirit which he desires and into whatever unity of organization he plans. I would not want to think for one moment that the whole future of Methodism hinges on the action of the few men in this room or on the action of these few hours. There is another chapter in every life. We must all believe in the future. I believe that we are going forward now and that we are not going to be disappointed. I say this in the hope that we shall not

let go of anything good, no matter what happens in the days to come; but that the great Lord who is leading us will continue to lead us. The movement of Methodism was inspired of the Almighty, and nothing can stop it or sweep it aside. Its future is as certain as that the stars will continue their courses. God help us to measure up to our duties and to stand for the things we ought to stand for until the day comes for the proper solution of our problems!

R. E. Blackwell: Brother Leete has said what I wanted to say, and that is that God is not going to consider as finality anything we do or any plan that we can refer to our General Conferences. There is going to be growth after we come together. There is going to be a sloughing of those things we think now are all right; but that may turn out not to be good, and therefore there is going to be growth in that direction too; but we must not think that the thing decided on here is a finality. Those who cannot agree to that may think that we are fixing something on the Church that will stay for all time, but we are not. God has promised to be with us, and he is going to be with us when we come on to plans that all of us think are not the wisest plans; but we will work toward the wisest plans, and the real things we all want are going to show themselves in the future, and I hope the near future; but certainly in the future as God works through us toward his great purpose there is going to be growth if we do come together or if we do not come together, there is going to be growth in the things that satisfy only part of the unified Church. Don't let us think that if we agree on something that we all do not think wise that that is passing on the Church for all time and for all eternity.

W. N. Ainsworth: I tried not to delay the body with superfluous words in saying you were welcome here this morning; and it occurs to me now that we ought not to be taking counsel of our fears, but ought to move forward to a fair consideration of the troubles before us. I hope that we shall do that without further delay.

H. M. Du Bose: I announce that at the meeting of the representatives of the Church, South, we selected Bishop Denny to preside in place of Bishop Candler during the latter's absence.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Secretary will make a note of that. We will now have the roll call.

The roll was called and the following were present: Bishops Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, James Atkins, from the M. E. Church, South; Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke, from the M. E. Church. Ministers: F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J.

Lamar, A. F. Watkins, from the M. E. Church, South; Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, J. W. Van Cleve, J. J. Wallace, C. M. Stuart, from the M. E. Church. Laymen: M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, from the M. E. Church, South; G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, H. W. Rogers, Alexander Simpson, Jr., Rola V. Watt, J. R. Joy, from the M. E. Church.

Bishop Denny: I want to call attention to the fact that word has come from Bishop Hoss that his physician has directed him not to leave home at this time and that Bishop Atkins, a reserve Commissioner, was notified and is here; and I take great pleasure in presenting my colleague and my very warm friend, Bishop James Atkins.

Secretary A. W. Harris: I have a letter, dated January 10, from Mr. Fairbanks stating that he is not well and probably will not find it possible to be present. I suggest that this letter be put in full in the record. Is it your pleasure that it be read in full now?

This was desired, and the letter in full is as follows:

HOTEL MARYLAND, PASADENA, CAL., January 10, 1918.

My Dear Mr. Harris: Your favor of the 22d of December did not reach Indianapolis until after I had left for the Pacific Coast to remain until the middle of March.

I very much fear that it will be impossible for me to attend the next meeting of the Joint Commission, which is to convene on the 23d inst. I am laboring under a temporary ailment, and my physician insists that I shall not leave here this month. I was at first inclined to disregard his advice; but my daughter, who is with me, insists that I shall respect, and her wishes in the matter are a law to me.

It is possible that before the actual date of the assembling of the Commission I may be given my liberty—but I fear not. If I am prohibited from being with you, it will be the greatest possible disappointment to me.

I am so thoroughly interested in the work we have in hand that I wish to contribute everything within my power which may aid in the consummation of our undertaking. My eagerness is great indeed, and I regret that I cannot add to the solution according to the measure of my anxiety. The unification of the two branches of Methodism is of the most vital importance facing our Churches at the present moment.

The thought of being denied the privilege of participating in the final negotiations fills me with a disappointment I cannot readily express to you.

With all good wishes,

Faithfully your friend,

CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS.

P. S.—I wish to be very kindly remembered to our mutual friends when you see them.

C. W. F

Secretary A. W. Harris: Now I move that Mr. James R. Joy be seated in place of Mr. Fairbanks. Mr. Joy is first alternate.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Just let it be announced

that the first reserve member will take the place of Mr. Fairbanks.

Bishop Hamilton: I note from the reading of the minutes that both Bishop Candler and Bishop Hoss are not only not here, but that Bishop Hoss will not be here. I learn also that Bishop Candler is detained by some temporary illness. I do not know how prolonged it may be; but I desire at this time to move that we send a telegram to Bishop Hoss and, if necessary, one to Bishop Candler also, expressing our sympathy with them in their absence. I do not want to indicate that there is any very serious illness, but to express our appreciation of them and tell them how glad we should be to have them here. I suppose some one can tell us whether we may expect Bishop Candler during the meeting. If not, I will include him in the telegram.

Bishop Denny: I was waiting for the roll to be completed before making official announcement that I had received a communication from Bishop Candler that his physician had urged him not to attempt a trip out of Atlanta unless it was in a sense absolutely necessary. Our Commission held a meeting of a few moments to give consideration to that, and I was requested to wire him to come as soon as he could come without jeopardy to his health. I was just writing that telegram. I second the motion of Bishop Hamilton to send greetings to Bishop Hoss.

A vote being taken, the motion of Bishop Hamilton was agreed to.

Frank M. Thomas: I have some communications that have been sent to me as one of the Secretaries of the Commission: Resolution from pastors of St. Louis; communication from St. Petersburg, Fla.; letter from Arthur DeLand and C. B. Duncan.

Secretary A. W. Harris: I have here a telegram addressed to Hon. George Warren Brown.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): What is the pleasure of the meeting? Is there anything on the program for this first meeting?

Bishop Hamilton: Are there any minutes?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The minutes were read and approved before we adjourned at Traverse City.

Secretary A. W. Harris: We have recommitted the report on Judicial Council and the report on the Status of the Negro.

Secretary Frank M. Thomas: The report of the Committee on Other Conferences also.

Bishop Cranston: I would like to have it go on the record that the Committee on the Status of the Negro was called to meet in the city yesterday morning at ten o'clock to hear the report of the subcommittee. There was no quorum of the committee present, owing to belated trains. The committee met

at the De Soto Hotel in the evening and heard the report of the subcommittee; but, because of the absence of both Dr. Jones and Dr. Penn, it was thought best not to determine the exact form which the report should take until they should arrive, so the committee adjourned subject to the call of the Chair. Dr. Jones has come in this morning and I presume we shall take the first opportunity during the hours of the day to have a meeting and to compare our reports.

Bishop Hamilton: What are we going to do about hours of meeting?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): That has not yet been decided upon.

Bishop Hamilton: Will Dr. Ainsworth make a motion in regard to it?

W. N. Ainsworth: I suppose we could very conveniently meet at ten o'clock each morning. This city orders its affairs by Eastern time, and ten o'clock Eastern time would be a good time to meet. I move that we meet at that hour and adjourn at will.

Edgar Blake: Is there any objection to our meeting at nine-thirty?

W. N. Ainsworth: The only objection I could cite to that suggestion is that there are probably a good many gentlemen on this Commission who do not ordinarily arise and eat their breakfast and get to their business that early. As a matter of fact, these brethren are all in hotels where they can get their meals whenever they want, but at my house I hardly ever eat breakfast until about nine o'clock by Eastern time; but if you want to meet at nine o'clock you can all come over together at that time, or if you want to meet at nine-thirty or ten o'clock it is all right with me.

Edgar Blake: The hours of meeting at Traverse City were nine until twelve-thirty. I suggest as a compromise to Dr. Ainsworth to make the hours now nine-thirty to twelve-thirty, and so I move.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: I now move that the hours for the afternoon session be two-thirty to five.

John M. Moore: I wish Dr. Blake would make that from three to five. If we close at twelve-thirty, we have to get dinner with slow service and have a committee meeting occasionally, and I think from three to five would be better.

Edgar Blake: Put it three to five then.

David G. Downey: Make it three to five-thirty.

A. J. Lamar: Would it not be better to meet at three-thirty and adjourn at will?

Edgar Blake: I think we can get along better if we fix our hours of meeting right now

W. N. Ainsworth: I hope in the afternoon you will not meet before three o'clock. Perhaps there may not be a great deal of inconvenience; but if any of you gentlemen should be invited to luncheon you would not be through much before two-thirty, and three o'clock, Eastern time, is an early time to get at anything after the noon hour.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I shall put the motion for three and half-past five for the afternoon meeting.

A vote being taken, the motion was agreed to.

Bishop Mouzon: The Committee on General Reference has not had any meeting as yet. There was no occasion for a meeting. I think, however, that if the Joint Commission is not to meet this afternoon this Committee on General Reference should have a meeting, and I rise to inquire if the Joint Commission will have a session this afternoon.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The time has just been fixed for such a meeting.

Edgar Blake: May I call attention to the fact that when we adjourned at Traverse City we had under consideration the report of the Committee on Conferences? There were a number of items in that report recommitted to the committee for further investigation and report. Following the close of that meeting we had a meeting, and these matters that were recommitted by the Joint Commission to that committee were referred to a certain Committee of Four. That subcommittee has done its work. But we have had no opportunity as yet to meet with our committee as a whole for the purpose of reporting to them our recommendations and findings. I do not know whether the other standing committees are in the same situation or not, but the Committee on Conferences (and I say this without consultation with the committee) ought to be permitted to have a meeting before it presents its further report to the body.

Bishop McDowell here came into the room.

Henry Wade Rogers: Here is the Chairman of that committee now.

Edgar Blake: I move that when we adjourn we adjourn to meet at nine-thirty to-morrow morning in order that the standing committees may have as much of the intervening time as is necessary for their work.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

David G. Downey: I would like to make inquiry of the Committee on Conferences. There was a resolution passed just before we adjourned at Traverse City, made by Mr. Maddin, and carried as follows:

I wish to move that the committee give us the benefit of those details in order that we may have an understanding of the arrangement that they shall make in these Regional Conferences within thirty or sixty days—in other words, that they shall make a report showing the areas of each State and Regional Conference and the number of preachers and the number of probationers in each Conference and what Annual Conferences exist in the State and whether any Annual Conference will split up this arrangement as suggested, how many members will be affected in each State and in each Regional Conference, and how many colored Conferences and the number of preachers and members.

It was understood that within a reasonable time we would get those facts and figures and have them before us for our consideration. I do not know whether other members of the Commission are in the same condition that I am, but I have not received anything, and I am wondering whether anybody received anything. If not, I would like to know if we are to receive that information.

Bishop Denny: During the absence of Bishop Hoss at Traverse City, I was placed on the Committee on Conferences. Bishop Atkins has come in as a member of this Commission, and I ask the privilege of asking Bishop Atkins as our representative in place of Bishop Hoss on that Commission to take my place.

David G. Downey: I hope that will not sidetrack my inquiry.

Bishop Denny: I do not so understand. I thought the inquiry had been answered.

David G. Downey: No, sir; I am waiting for my answer.

Bishop McDowell: What is the inquiry?

David G. Downey: I want to know what was done under the motion with regard to the facts about the Regional Conferences which was passed at Traverse City.

Bishop Cranston: There might be a question as to the meaning of this general inquiry.

David G. Downey: That may be, but there was a fact back of that statement which we all recognize. What I want to know is whether the purpose of the resolution has been carried out or whether it is the intention of the Committee on Conferences to carry it out.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): There was a motion made by Mr. Maddin and Bishop McDowell made some statement and Dr. Blake made some statement. I believe there was a motion by Bishop McDowell and there is some confusion there as to the meaning of the Journal.

David G. Downey: There is no confusion about the motion that Mr. Maddin made. That motion was made and was seconded and was put and carried. There were various remarks afterwards suggesting that it could be done in thirty or sixty days, but there was no suggestion that it could not be done at all.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The motion of Bishop McDowell was not with reference to that subject. It preceded the motion offered by Mr. Maddin.

David G. Downey: Then it does not affect the Maddin motion?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): There is no record that Mr. Maddin's motion was carried.

Edgar Blake: The brethren will find the following entry in the minutes: "Moved by Mr. Maddin that the Committee on Conferences give us the benefit of its details in order that we may have an understanding of the arrangement that they shall make with reference to those Conferences and the Regional Conferences within thirty to sixty days." That is, they shall make a report showing all the details of the Conferences, including the number of members, etc. May I say concerning that, that the Subcommittee of Four, to whom all these matters were referred, tried to have a meeting in Chicago early in September, but we were not able to secure a meeting at that time. The next earliest date that we could arrange for a meeting of the committee was the last week in December. The Committee of Four met and did its work and has the information asked for so far as it has been possible for us to secure the information, and what we desire is an opportunity to present that information to the full Committee on Conferences in order that it may come before this body in regular form.

David G. Downey: I am glad to have this illuminating statement and glad that we are to have those facts even at this late hour, but I desire to call the attention of the Commission to the fact that the intention of the motion was that we should have that information sometime prior to this meeting, so that we might study it and get the information which was in possession of the smaller committee. We are not now privileged to have that. I hope we shall have it even for the limited time that we can stay here. I understand the difficulty under which the committee has labored and I am not trying to find any unnecessary fault. But the point is, here are great masses of figures, tabulations, and we have to go over them in a very limited time and work under great pressure.

Edgar Blake: Mr. Chairman, will you permit one further word? I know my friend Brother Downey would not find any unnecessary fault—

David G. Downey: But this is a necessary fault.

Edgar Blake: And he has not. May I say that our committee is not the only sinner in this respect? If you will turn to the minutes of the Traverse City meeting, you will find that all the standing committees were to have their reports ready at least thirty days before this meeting and the reports were to be

distributed; but so far as I know not a single committee has done that.

Bishop McDowell: I am here and my delay was because my train was late. I will take the responsibility myself for the failure of our committee in not submitting its report. We did not do it and we should have done it. I think we tried to do it, but things have not been as easy as they might have been for us. But I am sure the Committee on Conferences will be glad at the earliest moment to put in the hands of the entire Commission all the facts and the plans and the arrangements in our possession.

Various announcements were made.

Secretary A. W. Harris read a telegram.

The session closed with the singing of the doxology and a benediction by Bishop Cranston.

SECOND DAY, THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 1918.

MORNING SESSION.

The Joint Commission was called to order by Bishop Mouzon. The hymn, "All hail the power of Jesus' name," was sung and prayer was offered by Dr. Neff.

The eighty-fourth Psalm was read by Bishop Mouzon.

Prayer was offered by Bishop Leete.

The Chairman (Bishop Mouzon): Let me explain that Bishop Denny is delayed by being somewhat indisposed this morning. He will be here presently. The Secretary will please read the minutes.

The minutes of January 23, 1918, were read and approved.

Bishop Denny here came into the room.

The Secretary read a telegram from Judge H. H. White saying that he was delayed by missing a connection, but expected to be here Thursday evening.

Bishop Cranston: There has come to me, addressed to the Joint Commission on Unification, a communication of three pages as to matters before the Conference. I think I will move its reference to the Committee on Conferences as the most appropriate committee. It is a matter that is not necessary to be read.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The roll was then called and the following were present: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke, Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. B. Murrah, James Atkins. Ministers: Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M.

Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. W. Van Cleve, J. J. Wallace, C. M. Stuart, F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar. Laymen: G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, H. W. Rogers, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves.

Bishop Cranston: The Committee on the Status of the Negro is ready to report through its Secretary, Dr. Moore.

The Chairman (Bishop Mouzon): Dr. Moore will present that report.

John F. Goucher: Would it not be in order to call for the reading of all the reports, as we did in Traverse City, so far as they are ready?

The Chairman (Bishop Mouzon): That is for the Commission to determine.

Bishop Cranston: It seems that the one committee whose work has been delayed should have precedence. The Committee on Conferences is one of these and the Commission on Judicial Council another. This latter report is ready, as I understand, and if we get this matter up we shall be ready to obtain a view of the general situation better than we would if we would take up some of the other committees' work now.

John F. Goucher: I move that we proceed to call for committees in the order that they were called at Traverse City, if I can get a second to that motion.

The motion was seconded.

John F. Goucher: In Traverse City we had all the reports read in order to have a general view of the situation. We spent considerable time on the report on Conferences and we agreed tentatively on all matters except two points which were postponed. Other matters were recommitted. We had also before us the report of the Committee on Judicial Council, and that report has been submitted to the separate Commissions. The separate Commissions have considered it in detail, of course tentatively, and that will be followed by reports. It seems to me the natural course would be to proceed to the reading of reports, if that is desirable, and to the consideration of the report of the Committee on Judicial Council, and my motion is that we proceed with the order that we established at Traverse City, that we shall have the reports read so far as they are ready and then start in the order in which they were considered at Traverse City.

A. J. Lamar: Ordinarily a method of procedure would amount to little, but in this case I hope the Commission will not adopt Dr. Goucher's motion, but will take Bishop Cranston's sug-

gestion. I do not know whether it was put in the form of a motion or not. The reason for that is simply this: We all know and we have known from the beginning that the crux of the situation is the Status of the Colored Membership in the Methodist Episcopal Church. We can arrange everything else, and yet when we come to that, if we can't arrange that, if we come to a deadlock on that, it renders null and void everything that we have done before. So that, in the interest of economy of time, I think we should take up our most difficult question first. If we can settle that, we can settle everything. If we cannot settle that, we cannot settle anything; and I hope Dr. Goucher's motion will not prevail.

Bishop Cranston here took the chair as presiding officer.

Rolla V. Watt: At Baltimore, and also at Traverse City, I had exactly the same view of the matter as has been expressed by Dr. Lamar. It seems to me, since we have practically recognized that there is one question that will be most difficult, we should dispose of that with a view of saving time, if we cannot agree on that one point. I was hopelessly in the minority at both conferences, and now, having gone so far in the other direction, I think we should complete the work in that direction, leaving this one question so that if we do finally fail, and I do not believe we shall, the matter will rest where it is, that we have agreed on all points but one. I hope Dr. Goucher's plan will prevail. I believe it is logical, and it is a continuation of the method that we have heretofore adopted.

Bishop Mouzon: I think it is quite important that, if possible, we should take up now the report of the Committee on the Status of the Negro in the Reorganized Church. At our meeting at Traverse City I insisted that this report should be delayed as long as possible in order that we might have ample time to consider every aspect of this important matter. We have now had ample time. We have reached tentative agreements touching the Conferences and I think also touching the Judicial Councils. We all know perfectly well that the Status of the Colored Man in the Reorganized Church is the question which concerns us most deeply just now and upon the solution of which will depend the outcome of this meeting. It will be remembered that at Traverse City we spent much time talking about little things and that at the very last hour we felt the need of taking up this matter and did not have time to do so. Many of us, in fact all, are busy men, and I sincerely hope that we shall not crowd into a day or two days a discussion of a matter that ought to consume the larger part of our time while here. If we can determine just what should be done with this report, the other matters are going to settle themselves, I feel quite sure. I certainly hope, therefore, we shall immedi-

ately hear the report of the Committee on the Status of the Colored Man.

John M. Moore: I am in hearty sympathy with the remarks made by Bishop Mouzon, but I want to say that one member of the Commission is not here who should be here when we take up the discussion of this report. Dr. Penn was to be here this morning at nine-twenty. He has been ill for several weeks. We are expecting him almost at any moment, and I think it would be just and proper that we should delay the consideration for the report on the Status of the Negro in the Reorganized Church until Dr. Penn arrives. I think he will be here shortly, and I trust that the Commission will consent to that much of a postponement in view of his absence.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I suppose our order of business really contemplates the continuation of the consideration of the report of the Committee on Conferences, but that committee late yesterday afternoon remained in session until about a quarter past six and was unable to complete its report, so that in point of fact if we went on with the report of the Committee on Conferences we would in a short time reach the end of that report so far as it has been acted upon by the committee. It seems to me, therefore, it is wise that that report should be sidetracked for the present until we can reach a final conclusion upon it. There are many subjects to be considered by the Joint Commission on the report of that committee, and for that reason I am in antagonism to Dr. Goucher's motion. In view of what Dr. Moore has just said—and it was a very kindly thought and one which I appreciated—I think it would be wise to take up the report of the Committee on Judicial Council until Dr. Penn arrives. I therefore offer as a substitute for all that has been proposed that we take up the report of the Committee on Judicial Council, and that upon the arrival of Dr. Penn we take up the report of the Committee on the Status of the Negro.

Bishop Denny here took the chair as presiding officer.

John F. Goucher: I am perfectly willing to accept the substitute.

A vote being taken, the substitute offered by Mr. Alex. Simpson, Jr., which by the acceptance of Dr. Goucher became the original motion, was carried.

Bishop Cooke: Your Committee on Judicial Council is ready to report.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Have you copies of that report?

Secretary Frank M. Thomas: There are only a few, and it will be necessary to follow it closely. There will be more copies very shortly.

Bishop Cooke: I might say in a preliminary way that we

have had delightful meetings. We have had no debates: we have had conversations, and, owing to the splendid work done by the members of the committee—Bishop Murrah, Dr. Thomas, Dr. Lamar, and Dr. Downey—there was very little to do except to go over what had been decided upon, and I am glad to present the report.

Bishop Cranston: On a matter of privilege: Judge Charles A. Pollock, one of our Reserve Commissioners to fill a vacancy, has arrived, and I would like to have Judge Pollock introduced.

Judge Pollock was then presented to the Joint Commission.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): We have before us then, I understand, the report of the Committee on Judicial Council and we are ready to proceed.

Bishop Cooke: I am reading the report myself rather than the Secretary because there are a few little changes in it that are known to me better than the Secretary could know them without having them explained to him.

Thereupon the report was read as follows:

THE JUDICIAL COUNCIL.

1. *Title and Purpose.*—There shall be a Court of Appeals to be known as the Judicial Council, whose decision shall be final except as otherwise provided.

2. *Composition.*—The Judicial Council shall be composed of two members, one lay and one ministerial, from each Regional Jurisdiction, and one-half as many clerical and lay members to be elected by the General Conference.

3. *Election.*—The lay and ministerial members from the Regional Conference shall be chosen by their respective orders at the session next preceding the General Conference, said election being by ballot. Said members shall be subject to confirmation by the General Conference.

4. *Term of Service.*—Members of the Council shall serve for four years, subject to reelection. Except in the case provided in Section 10, the term of service of each member shall expire at the close of the General Conference succeeding that at which his term began.

5. *Eligibility.*—Lay and ministerial members of the Council shall not be eligible to membership in the General or Quadrennial Conferences; nor shall they hold any other connectional office, nor serve on any connectional board of the Church during such term. No member of the Council shall hear, review, or determine any case before the Judicial Council to which he may be in any way related, nor shall he sit in the Council while such case is being examined.

6. *Organization.*—The members of the Judicial Council shall convene at the close of the General Conference following their election, and shall organize after their confirmation by the General Conference by choosing from their number by ballot a President and Secretary for the ensuing quadrennium. In the absence of the President at any meeting of the Council they shall elect a President *pro tem*. The Secretary shall keep a faithful record of all proceedings, records, and documents in each and every case coming before the Council with the decision and reason for the same in every case, and shall report such decision to the parties involved and also to the succeeding General Conference.

7. *Powers.*—The Judicial Council shall have full power to review, on

appeal on constitutional grounds, the acts of the General and Quadrennial Conferences, the records and documents transmitted to it from Judicial Conferences, to hear and determine questions of law and all other appeals coming to it in course of lawful procedure from Annual Conferences, from Judicial and Quadrennial Conferences (hereafter to be provided), and from the General Conference; provided that no appeal from any Conference shall be entertained unless the same is signed by at least one-fifth of the Conference. In all cases the decision of the Judicial Council shall be final. Provided that if, on a constitutional question, there shall be a majority vote of the members of the General Conference, present and voting, disapproving a decision of the Judicial Council, the question involved shall then be sent to the Annual Conferences for final decision, as provided in Section 11, Article VIII. of the Constitution.

8. *Government.*—The Judicial Council shall prescribe rules and regulations for its government and methods of procedure for the hearing and disposing of appeals, which rules and methods shall be printed in the Discipline, and shall not be changed or altered during the quadrennium, without due notice.

9. *Quorum.*— — members of the Judicial Council shall constitute a quorum, and in no instance shall the Council hear or determine any case without such quorum.

10. *Meetings During Quadrennium.*—The Judicial Council shall meet at the same time and place as the General Conference, and shall continue in session until final adjournment of the General Conference; provided, that if during the session of a General Conference the appeal of a bishop who has been tried for any Disciplinary offense is pending, the Judicial Council shall defer its time of adjournment until it disposes of said appeal.

The Judicial Council shall convene during each quadrennium at such times and places as it may deem necessary to hear and determine appeals coming to it by lawful procedure from Quadrennial, Annual, and Judicial Conferences in the several jurisdictions.

11. *Vacancies.*—Vacancies shall be filled by the Council from the same order, lay or ministerial, and jurisdiction in which the vacancy occurs until the next meeting of the Quadrennial Conference of that Jurisdiction.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The report is before the Commission. Gentlemen, what is your pleasure?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I move that we proceed to take up the articles *seriatim*.

T. N. Ivey: I would ask if there is a copy for each member of the Commission.

Bishop Cooke: There is not a copy for each now, and I think it would be well if it were printed. Now I wish to say that where the words "Quadrennial Conference" occur substitute the word "Regional," because we have decided to change that word. When this was prepared we prepared it "Quadrennial," but we have decided to substitute the word "Regional" instead of "Quadrennial."

Bishop McDowell: There is a printed copy on page 25 of the Proceedings of the Traverse City meeting which will be a sufficient guide while we are considering this report, at least until new copies can be obtained.

Bishop Cooke: I thought it would.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): We are on the motion made

by Mr. Simpson that we take this up *seriatim*. Are you ready for the question?

A vote being taken, the motion was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The first section of the report is before you.

Bishop Cooke: I move the adoption of the first item.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: I move that we have each item read as we pass upon it.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): It is not necessary to have a motion to that end. When a reading is called for it will be had. The Secretary will read the first section.

The section was read, as follows:

1. *Title and Purpose*.—There shall be a Court of Appeals to be known as the Judicial Council, whose decision shall be final except as otherwise provided.

Bishop Cooke: I move the adoption of this section.

The motion was seconded.

Bishop Cranston: Is that sufficiently definite? "As otherwise provided." Where and by whom?

Bishop Cooke: That comes later on.

Bishop Cranston: If that is so, let us say "herein."

Bishop Cooke: It is provided for in Section 7: "Provided that if, on a constitutional question, there shall be a majority of the members of the General Conference, present and voting, disapproving a decision of the Judicial Council, the question involved shall then be sent to the Annual Conferences for final decision, as provided in Section 11, Article VIII. of the Constitution." There is no objection, however, to using the word "herein." We can add that word and let the latter part of it read "except as herein otherwise provided."

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Is there any objection to the insertion of the word "herein" before the word "otherwise"? I hear none. So I take it that that is the will of the Commission, and without objection it will be understood that the word "herein" is to be inserted.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Now the adoption of it has been moved.

Bishop Cranston here took the chair as presiding officer.

Bishop Denny: I think it is not simply the atmosphere in which for so many years I have lived that leads me to call attention to a matter of moment just here, but a rather important point is involved. From the time of Sir Francis Bacon all of us who have taken occasion to reason have felt the force of what he said about the atmosphere a word carries. We use the word "court" here. A court has a distinct association, a set of associations, and if we use the word "court" here we are bound

to carry into our proceedings all the associations that are wrapped around a court. We have found great difficulty in our own Church because we are constantly speaking of "ecclesiastical courts," and many of the brethren look upon a committee of investigation as a grand jury and they speak about a Church trial as a "prosecution," and we have in some institutions actually gotten ourselves entangled in the close technicalities of criminal procedure. Now, there is no use for us to carry all the atmosphere and the association of our complex system of civil judicature into an ecclesiastical Judicial Council and we could avoid a great deal of that by terming this "Court of Appeals" a "Committee of Appeals," or something of that kind, anything that would take us out of that great mass of developed technicalities which we find in many respects to be so oppressive to our modern life. I suggest, indeed I very heartily urge, that we use some other word than "court" here. Would it satisfy the committee if we should say "There shall be a Council of Appeals"?

Thomas D. Samford: I suggest the use of the word "tribunal."

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Why not put it in this form, which avoids all the difficulty you suggest and which, by the way, occupied three weeks in the United States Senate in the debate of the impeachment of Andrew Johnson: "There shall be and there hereby is established a Judicial Council, whose decisions shall be final except as herein otherwise provided." I move that as an amendment, or rather as a substitute for what the committee has reported.

The motion was seconded.

Bishop Cooke: I suppose we could invent reasons for anything, for there never was yet anything proposed but what the wit of man could uphold the opposite. The word "court" does carry with it associations which you yourself, speaking generically, would inject into it. It is a word which has been used in our Methodism perhaps from the beginning. It is a word which is used by the Methodists of Canada. In fact, the Head Judicial Tribunal, as I would call it, though I have not seen it for years, not since I was in Cincinnati, has a title, "The Supreme Court." So that it does not necessarily follow at all that they should be generated in a legal settled court atmosphere. We can create one and inject it into it, but it does not belong to it. However, this suggestion which Judge Simpson makes would not, I suppose, be objectionable to the committee. Would it, Bishop Murrah?

Bishop Murrah: No. But I do not see any objection to the word "court." I am more opposed to the word "council" than I am to the word "court."

Bishop Cooke: It is not an invented objection, it does not arise in the nature of the thing itself. There is always an atmos-

phere about words, not only an atmosphere, but different kinds of atmospheres. There are political associations and religious associations and family associations connected with words. Words have their nature, but that nature depends on the subject to which they are related.

Bishop Murrah: I have no objection to the motion made by my brother on my right [Mr. Alex. Simpson, Jr.] and am willing to accept it, but I doubt if we should consume time at the beginning discussing these things. "Court" is not an offensive term to me and I do not think it is to any one. We can fancy all kinds of objections, but if we go into these we can make more objections to "council" than we can to "court." Personally, I prefer it to stand just as it is, though I shall not make any objection.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The question is on the motion of Brother Simpson.

A vote being taken, the amendment of Mr. Alexander Simpson, Jr., was agreed to.

David G. Downey: What is the official title of that article?

Bishop Cooke: "The Judicial Council."

David G. Downey: What is the title for that clause?

Bishop Cooke: "Title and Purpose."

David G. Downey: There is no purpose indicated now and you should delete "and purpose," and I so move.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): We have just adopted an amendment. Perhaps the section as amended should first come before us.

David G. Downey: I want to call attention to the fact that as originally written "Court of Appeals" did indicate the purpose that it was a council for appeal, so that the caption had some relevancy to the subject matter of the section.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: "Finality of decision" is as much a purpose as "Court of Appeals."

David G. Downey: I want to make the caption harmonize with the subject matter a little more closely

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): As I understand the parliamentary situation, we have amended the section. Now, shall the section as amended be adopted? It is so moved.

The reading of the section as amended and for the adoption of which the motion was made was called for, and it was read, as follows:

There shall be and there hereby is established a Judicial Council, whose decision shall be final except as herein otherwise provided.

A vote being taken, the section was adopted.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Now, what is the pleasure of the committee?

David G. Downey: I move that the caption be simply "Title," and that the words "and Purpose" be stricken out.

Frank M. Thomas: The very fact that you make it a court of final decision indicates the purpose.

Bishop Cranston: Should not the word be "decision"?

Bishop Cooke: We have it "decision." It was made "decision" by Mr. Simpson's amendment.

John F. Goucher: As this is a tentative vote, I move that we leave the titles until we get through the whole document and we can then decide what to do with the titles.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Without putting that to a vote, does that meet with the approval of the body? I hear no objection, and the Secretary will read Section 2.

The second section was read as follows:

The Judicial Council shall be composed of two members, one lay and one ministerial, from each Regional Jurisdiction, and one-half as many clerical and lay members to be elected by the General Conference.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I suggest that we use the word "ministerial" throughout, and that the word "clerical" in the latter part of the section be changed to "ministerial." I presume there is no objection to that?

Bishop Cooke: No.

John M. Moore: There is a clear implication there that these two men are to be elected by the Regional Conferences of the Jurisdiction, but it does not say so.

Bishop Murrah: The next section does, Dr. Moore.

John M. Moore: I beg pardon, so it does.

Bishop Cranston: I suppose it is clear enough after you read it a second time, but it is a very awkward clause: "The Judicial Council shall be composed of two members." Your thought stops there and then you go on, "one lay and one ministerial, from each Jurisdiction and so many members elected by the General Conference." I may be hypercritical about it, but I would rather strike out the words "two members," and I would have it read: "The Judicial Council shall be composed of one lay and one ministerial delegate from each Regional Jurisdiction" and so many delegates elected by the General Conference.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): You have heard the amendment to strike out the words "two members," following the word "of" and before the word "one" in the first line.

Edwin M. Randall: Then the word "delegates" should be inserted.

Bishop Cooke: We accept the amendment proposed by Bishop Cranston.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That amendment is accepted, and the section now reads: "The Judicial Council shall

be composed of one minister and one layman from each Regional Jurisdiction and one-half as many ministerial and lay members to be elected by the General Conference."

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Would not the word "member" be better throughout?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Does that mean Regional Conferences or Regional Jurisdictions?

Bishop Cooke: Regional Conferences.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): We were speaking in the terminology of Conferences and not of Jurisdictions, and ought not this to be each Regional Conference?

Edgar Blake: May I call attention to this? That we have provided that there shall be certain Regional Jurisdictions, each having its own Regional Conference. Now, if this should stand as suggested, "The Judicial Council shall be composed of one lay and one ministerial member from each Regional Conference," that would seem to limit the election of members from the Regional Conferences to that body, and I judge that is not the intention. What is desired is that the election shall be from within the jurisdiction.

Bishop Cooke: That is right.

John M. Moore: I would accept that interpretation, but it seems to me that the word "representative" would be better than "member." "One representative" from each Jurisdiction rather than "one member."

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Do you offer that as an amendment?

John M. Moore: Yes, that we change the word "member" to "representative."

The motion was seconded.

David G. Downey: I don't think you need say other "member" or "representative"; you can simply say "one layman and one minister," then you can use "ministerial" in the next clause where you have the additional representative. I suggest that instead of the language as it stands at present we say that "The Judicial Council shall be composed of one lay and one ministerial representative," that it shall be composed of one layman and one minister from each jurisdiction.

John M. Moore: I would accept that.

Rolla V. Watt: Then use the word "representative" in the next clause?

Alex. Simpson: You used "member" there.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: That leaves indeterminate the closing clause of the paragraph. There shall be a like number of ministerial and lay—Why not carry through what we have started out with and say so many ministers and so many lay-

men—ministers and laymen selected by the General Conference?

Abram W. Harris: May I ask what will be the size of this Council?

Frank M. Thomas: It was figured that there would be six or seven Regional Conferences. Say there will be six, each being entitled to two would give twelve, and half of that number would be six. We thought it would not be wise to make it any larger than that because it would be too large.

Abram W. Harris: What about the foreign Conferences?

Frank M. Thomas: That would depend upon their status.

Bishop Cooke: When this was prepared it was indefinite as to the number of Regional Conferences that would be proposed and that would be left indefinite to be changed by this body after the number of Regional Conferences was determined.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The amendment is before you. The amendment is that you change the words "ministerial" and "lay" to "minister" and "layman," "one minister and one layman. Are you ready for the vote on the amendment?

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): What is the word now that follows the word "member," one lay and one ministerial? What follows there?

David G. Downey: It reads "one minister and one layman."

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Now, who elects this layman and this minister?

David G. Downey: That is provided in the next section.

Rolla V. Watt: What about the second part: One-half as many clerical and lay members to be elected by the General Conferences?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): We have not adopted as yet. The section as amended is before the Commission.

Frank M. Thomas (Reading):

The Judicial Council shall be composed of one minister and one layman from each Regional Jurisdiction and one-half as many members, ministerial and lay, to be elected by the General Conference.

John F. Goucher: I said that was substituted. I don't think you are reading it exactly as it stands now.

Frank M. Thomas: Yes, I am reading it just exactly as it is.

A vote being taken, the section as amended was adopted.

Frank M. Thomas: I call attention to the fact that, as adopted, it reads: "One-half as many members." There is some question raised there.

H. M. Du Bose: The reading is a little obscure. Does it mean that this addendum membership is to be as much ministerial as lay?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: It says so.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): "Minister and layman" is inserted instead of "members."

A. F. Watkins: If it does not mean that, it does not mean anything.

J. W. Van Cleve: It does not mean that.

A. F. Watkins: Because they are to be taken from the ministers and laymen. If it does not mean that, it does not mean anything. They could not be taken from any place else. The thought occurred to me that it was probably sufficiently clear without the insertion of the additional phrase.

Edgar Blake: It appears to me that Dr. Du Bose's point is well taken. We provide that the Judicial Council shall be composed of one layman and one minister from each Regional Jurisdiction and one-half as many members, lay and ministerial, to be elected by the General Conference. Now, assuming that there would be six Regional Conferences, there would be twelve members, lay and ministerial in equal numbers, elected by these Regional Conferences. Now, it says that the General Conference shall elect one-half as many lay and ministerial members and it would be within their province to elect four ministers and two laymen. It seems we should have the amendment suggested by Dr. Du Bose, one-half as many members. That makes it clear, but in the other case there would be confusion.

John J. Wallace: That makes it perfectly clear on the assumption of Dr. Blake; but suppose there should be seven Conferences and there were to be seven elected. How can you divide seven equally?

Abram W. Harris: Just take an editor.

P. D. Maddin: You would have to get a preacher who was just half a preacher.

Edgar Blake: Then are we to understand that the court is not to be evenly divided as between the ministry and the laity? Is that the intention?

A. W. Harris: Is it desirable?

Edgar Blake: That is not the question. Is it the purpose of the committee to have this Judicial Council equally divided in its membership between ministers and laymen?

Bishop Cooke: It is.

Edgar Blake: Then it is not accomplished, as is shown by the illustration used by my friend Dr. Wallace. Suppose you have seven Jurisdictions?

Bishop Cooke: Suppose you do not. There is no use in wasting time on suppositions.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I did not know that Dr. Blake had yielded the floor.

Edgar Blake: I am glad to yield to Bishop Cooke.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Dr. Blake yields to Bishop Cooke.

Bishop Cooke: I suggest that you do not inject suppositions. One supposition is just as suppositional as the other.

Edgar Blake: Undoubtedly.

Bishop Cooke: I simply state that the Commission will understand that the Committee on Judicial Council is not possessed of divine knowledge or foreknowledge and we could not know what number of Regional Conferences would be established. We had to put in something to make the report. We cannot make an absolutely perfect report unless we have absolutely perfect knowledge of what you contemplate doing. The idea is, the very character of this section shows that the intention is, an equal number of lay and ministerial members. "There shall be two members, one minister and one lay, from each Regional Conference." Is that to be changed when it comes to an election by the General Conference in its own case when it is established that there shall be an equal number from the Regional Conferences? So that the logical conclusion is, if there is an equal number selected from the Regional Conferences the General Conference will also elect an equal number of lay and ministerial delegates.

Edgar Blake: There is an odd number.

Bishop Cooke: There will not be an odd number, but if you do have one there must be some other provision.

Edgar Blake: Will you permit me to call attention to the illustration used by my friend Dr. Wallace? If there are seven Regional Jurisdictions, the Regional Jurisdictions would elect fourteen members: seven ministers and seven laymen. If you provide that the General Conference shall elect one-half as many, which would be seven, you cannot possibly divide the seven elected by the General Conference equally between ministers and laymen.

Bishop Cooke: We know that.

George Warren Brown: Can you not use the word "substantially"?

Edgar Blake: Now, I understand the Chairman of the Committee, Bishop Cooke, to say that they purposed that the membership of this Council should be divided equally between ministers and the laity, and we are trying to point out that in its present form it will be impossible in certain cases to do that.

Bishop Cooke: Do you wish me to stick to that?

Edgar Blake: I don't know.

Bishop Cooke: Of course, if you have an odd number of Regional Conferences, then the case proposed does come before you, and in that case this will be changed to meet what you have done; but how can this committee provide for a thing that

does not exist until it is existent? If the Committee on Regional Conferences says there shall be eight, this stands. If you determine that there shall be seven Regional Conferences, it does not stand. That is all there is to it. It is simply another case of *parturiunt montes*.

Bishop Hamilton: When we come to something that is contingent on something else, why not postpone it until the other matter is settled? I move to postpone the consideration of this subject until it is determined how many Regional Conferences there shall be.

Frank M. Thomas: I move as a substitute for that that we strike out the words "ministerial and lay" and put "one-half as many members," leaving it to the General Conference to determine.

Henry Wade Rogers: I heartily concur in the suggestion made by Bishop Hamilton, and I wish to suggest that it is most desirable that the number which constitutes this court should be an uneven number and not an even number. It is very embarrassing sometimes to have an even number, and as a rule the courts in this country do not consist of an even number of judges. The Courts of Appeals almost universally consist of an uneven number.

Bishop Hamilton: Could we not have one "at large"?

Abram W. Harris: Postponement will solve the question, because the number of Regional Conferences cannot be regarded as determined. They may fix an even number now and in five years we may have an odd number.

H. M. Du Bose: I was the innocent cause of this trouble, but I was very clear in my own mind as I am now. You are proceeding upon the understanding that we shall have six Regional Conferences. And that made possible equality in distribution. Then came the other suggestion of a possibility in which event this provision would not work. But Bishop Cooke has the right idea in this matter. We should go ahead and adopt the thing indicated first by myself and by Dr. Blake, and if at any time we have increased the number of Jurisdictional Conferences to an uneven number you will have to go back and change the fundamental part, but the only orderly way is to proceed under the supposition that we shall have six.

Henry Wade Rogers: The motion to postpone is a debatable question?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Yes, I think so.

Edgar Blake: I rise for another question in connection with this. In all probability whatever number of Regional Conferences we agree upon here, that number will have to increase from time to time in order to accommodate an expanding Church. The question I raise is as to whether we want to provide in so

large a measure as we are here providing for an increasing membership for this Judicial Council. I agree that the Regional Conferences should be represented in the Council, but I do not quite see the necessity of putting in a principle of procedure that the General Conference shall elect one-half as many as the Regional Conference. I think we should provide that the General Conference should elect a fixed number and let that remain. You want the Judicial balanced between the ministers and laity, and we can accomplish that here, it makes no difference how many Regional Conferences we have.

Alex. Simpson, Jr: Dr. Blake's last suggestion is the correct one, for two reasons. You will observe, when you come to the next section, that members elected by the Regional Conferences must, under this report, be confirmed by the General Conference, so that you have it to a degree resting upon the action of the General Conference as to every member of the Judicial Council. There is a second reason, it seems to me, which is much more important. If you are going to make a large Judicial Council, it will be top-heavy. It cannot do its work so well. A small committee can do work better than a large committee. Instead of having one-half the number of lay and ministerial delegates elected by the General Conference we should say a fixed number—say three, which I think would be ample. Where they have six Regional Conferences, that would make a Judicial Council of fifteen. If there were seven Regional Conferences, that would make a Judicial Council of seventeen, and either would be quite as large a Judicial Council as is desirable. I do not see, however, that a motion of that kind can be made as an amendment or substitute for the motion that is pending.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The motion is to postpone?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: And to that this would not be an amendment; but as it is a matter that has been debated, the members of the committee should be advised that if we vote down the motion to postpone there will be an amendment, as suggested by Dr. Blake, that the General Conference shall elect a certain number of members.

Rolla V. Watt: I think we had better let the motion to postpone prevail, and then the committee can revise that.

Bishop Cooke: I suggest that Mr. Watt's idea prevail and that it would be well now to refer this back to the committee and we will bring it in later.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The motion before us is to postpone until we shall have completed the matter of the number of Regional Conferences. It is not to postpone to a fixed time.

Bishop McDowell: I think the thing to do is to vote down the motion to postpone consideration and then to have Mr. Simpson's amendment in the line of Dr. Blake's suggestion. There

will be no discourtesy involved in refusing to postpone, and we can just as well make the amendment now as to send it back to the committee to be called together to make it.

A vote being taken on the motion to postpone, the same was declared lost.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Now, I move that the last clause of that paragraph, "one-half as many *clerical* and lay," be stricken out and that in its place be inserted "three members," so that the whole section will read: "The Judicial Council shall be composed of one minister and one layman from each Regional Jurisdiction, and three members to be elected by the General Conference."

J. H. Reynolds: I move as a substitute for that that we fix one instead of three.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I second that.

J. H. Reynolds: I substitute "one to be elected by the General Conference," because if you have as many as six Jurisdictional Conferences your court is already too large. And the election of one elected by the General Conference would make the odd number that you desire.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: We would then have a Judicial Council of thirteen.

J. H. Reynolds: Yes, but I have no superstition on that. I do not think I need discuss the point. I think it appeals to all of us. You create a cumbersome and expensive machinery. I would much prefer to see a court of about seven, one from each Jurisdictional Conference and one elected by the General Conference. Then you would have a body of men who would talk seriously, a body of men who will equip themselves seriously for their work and who will have a sense of individual responsibility. If you diffuse that responsibility in a large court, an individual loses his interest and you will never get the result you desire. I therefore move the substitution of "one" instead of "three."

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: If the gentleman who seconded me will consent, I will accept that.

George Warren Brown: I seconded the motion and I accept it. The amendment is that the blank be filled with the word "one."

Bishop Cooke: I suppose we all recognize the difficulty of organizing a body such as this is, which has to deal with the interests that will come before it. A large number militates against efficient work, I know; but, brethren, let us not think of the court only. Let us think of the Church. This court will have to receive popular approval of the people and of the ministers. And a court which is composed of men a majority of whom may be from one section of this country will hardly be

acceptable to the people of another section who are not represented, and it is for that reason that it should be acceptable throughout the whole Church and not simply by a part of the Church that we settled upon the number which has been indicated. If the members of the court are taken from the Eastern or the Northeastern or the Southeastern or the Southwestern parts of the country, and the West is not represented, because there are not enough positions to go around, there will be dissatisfaction and it will create criticism. We wanted to make it as large as possible without being cumbersome, so that all parts of the country would have a chance of representation in that court. The members of that court will have local affiliations and local interests; and suppose there is nobody there to represent the West or the great Northwest or the Southwest, they will say, "Those men don't understand the situation; they never come out here," and for that reason there will be dissatisfaction. We desire to distribute these places over the whole United States, and you cannot do that with a less number than we have provided. We know a few men can do better work than a larger number, but we put it this way with a long look ahead to popularizing this court throughout the organized Church.

Henry Wade Rogers: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that we have to adopt something like this, but I want to go on record as saying I don't think it is the wisest provision for us to adopt. I think it would be wiser if we had a court of seven selected by the General Conference instead of being elected by the Regional Conferences. A large court is cumbersome and, instead of getting along rapidly, gets along slowly. A court of the size proposed to be created here is too large. If the General Conference could elect, not on account of regional location, but because of fitness, seven men conspicuously fitted for service in such a court, we should be much better off.

Bishop Murrah: It occurs to me that there are reasons, very strong reasons, that I need not stop here to specify, why the number should be named that the General Conference is to elect. I thoroughly appreciate the force of what has been said as to the small court, but the idea of the representative character of the court appeals to me very strongly. In view of all the matters, I desire to offer as a substitute that instead of one or three to be elected by the General Conference we substitute five.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Is there a second? I do not hear any.

Bishop McDowell: The motion is then to insert "one" to be elected by the General Conference?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): To fill the blank with the word "one."

Bishop McDowell: I want to go back to Mr. Simpson's original motion for three. I do it for the reason that you have fixed for your quorum two-thirds of the body. In accordance with the present plan you could make a division of two-thirds of fifteen. But I am in favor of it for the additional reason: I think we have to make a little distinction between the efficiency and character of a civil court and an ecclesiastical body like this. I quite agree with what Judge Rogers said with reference to a court that has to deal with distinctly legal matters and one that has to deal with ecclesiastical affairs. I think we should get a great deal of strength and a little more popular quality for the court than we would obtain if the court were reduced to a small number. What Judge Rogers says with reference to the odd number is perfectly correct, but I would like to have three instead of one to be elected by the General Conference. I think that would give the General Conference a little more nearly proper representation in creating and composing this body.

The motion was seconded.

Bishop Cranston: In our Church (and I suppose the same prevails in the Church, South) the bishop appoints a chairman for service in the Annual Conference. You all understand that in proceedings in court the order which is desirable in conformity to law is the expression of judicial opinion from any authoritative source and must constitute an element of reliability and dependability. I doubt whether we could secure the best results by having twelve men coming from the Regional Conferences going into an election for a president of the court. It seems to me that if you have one from the General Conference it ought to be distinctly stated that the General Conference should name the President of the Judicial Council. If you should have three, I do not think that the principle would thereby be less valuable.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): There was an amendment to the original motion to adopt. Then there was an amendment introduced to strike out and insert and another amendment to change what was to be stricken out and inserted. That is the parliamentary status.

Bishop Cranston: Having thrown out the thought, I leave the matter until the parliamentary situation changes.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): We will now take the vote on the amendment to the amendment—that is, to fill the blank with the word “three.”

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to by twenty-six to fifteen on a rising vote.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The amendment to the amendment prevails and that settles the question as to the in-

section of the word "one." The body has voted to fill the blank with the word "three." Now, what will you do with the section as amended?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I move its adoption.

Bishop Cranston: I move this amendment: "Three from the General Conference, one of whom shall be appointed by the General Conference to preside over the Judicial Council."

Henry Wade Rogers: I wish to go on record as being against that. I think it is very unwise for the General Conference to undertake to say who shall be the Chairman or President of the Judicial Council. It is very much better for the men elected to the Judicial Council to decide that matter themselves. They are more competent than the General Conference to determine who shall be their Chairman, and I move as a substitute for what Bishop Cranston has offered that the President or Chairman, whatever he may be called, of the Judicial Council shall be elected by it.

Frank M. Thomas: That is provided for in another clause.

Henry Wade Rogers: Then I withdraw it.

Bishop Cranston: I am not at all sure that Judge Rogers is right. Sometimes he is and sometimes, when he disagrees with me, the preponderance of right is on my side. He is a lawyer and I am an experienced Church administrator. If he had as much trouble with incompetent chairmen over ecclesiastical proceedings as I have had, he would not want to take any chances of having an incompetent one at the head of the Judicial Council.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Were those troubles that you had due to the fact that the President of the Annual Conference was not competent or what?

Bishop Cranston: The President of the Annual Conference is subject to mistakes through listening to the opinions of others, but he may not know anything more than you do about the body generally. What I want to get at is this—this point comes up elsewhere?

Frank M. Thomas: Yes.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The motion before you now is to adopt Section 2 as amended.

John M. Moore: How does it read as amended?

Secretary Frank M. Thomas: "The Judicial Council shall be composed of one minister and one layman from each Regional Jurisdiction and three members elected by the General Conference." Ought not that to be "to be elected by the General Conference"?

Bishop Cranston: I would like to have another statement as to this point, whether the word "Jurisdiction" there is used in contradistinction to the word "Conference." If so, why?

Bishop Cooke: The word "Jurisdiction" was selected rather than the word "Conference" because the election could be taken from the entire territory embraced in that region and not necessarily from the Conference.

Bishop Cranston: Is not that a term that would pertain strictly to the matter of authority? Suppose you had a Regional Conference or a Regional Jurisdiction without Regional Conference power?

Bishop Cooke: The Regional Conference is one thing and the Regional Jurisdiction is another. Jurisdiction carries with it a territorial idea.

Bishop Cranston: I understand.

Bishop Cooke: So the parties who may be chosen for this office may be taken from any part of the country embraced in that region and not from any other, so that they may be taken from any part of the entire country, and not necessarily from the Regional Conference. There might be many people who might not be members of a Regional Conference who would be desirable on this body.

Bishop Cranston: The question as between the home area and the missionary area is not involved in this terminology.

Bishop Cooke: No.

A vote being taken, the second section was adopted.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The Secretary will please now report the third section.

The section was read, as follows:

The ministerial and lay members from the Regional Conference shall be chosen by their respective orders at the session next preceding the General Conference, said election being by ballot. Said members shall be subject to confirmation by the General Conference.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: In conformity with the action we have just taken, I would suggest that "Conference," following the word "Regional," should be stricken out and "Jurisdiction" inserted in its place, and after the word "orders" that we insert "in the Regional Conference," so that it would read: "The lay and ministerial members from the Regional Jurisdiction shall be chosen by their respective orders in the Regional Conference at its session next preceding the General Conference."

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Would it not be just as well to strike out the "from" and say "elected by"?

Joseph W. Van Cleve: That is a very good suggestion; I will agree to it.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Make the motion then, so that we can get it before us.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: I move to strike out the word "from" and put in the words "elected by."

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The amendment now is that in the first line the word "from" be stricken out and the words "elected by" inserted in its place.

Edgar Blake: May I call attention to the fact that that does not appear to accomplish what we want to do? We provide that the Judicial Council shall be composed of one layman and one minister from each Regional Jurisdiction and we do not say how elected. Then we go on to provide how they shall be elected. I think the form as we have it here is right without the amendment.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: You are right. My amendment is that it shall read: "The ministerial and lay members from the Regional Jurisdiction shall be chosen by their respective orders in the Regional Conference at its session next preceding the General Conference."

Edgar Blake: That is perfectly plain.

Bishop Cooke: But it is not the jurisdiction that is doing the electing.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: They are elected *in* the jurisdiction, not *from* the jurisdiction.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Let me state it: The amendment, as I understand it, is that the word "Conference" shall be stricken out and after the word "orders" insert "by the Regional Conference."

Bishop Cooke: You are inserting something.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: Yes, after the word "orders" I propose to insert "by the Regional Conference."

The amendment was seconded.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The Secretary will please read the section as it would be if this amendment were adopted.

Secretary Frank M. Thomas: As I have it, it would read: "The ministerial and lay members from the Regional Jurisdiction shall be chosen by their respective orders in the Regional Conference at its session next preceding the General Conference."

Edwin M. Randall: Is the word "jurisdiction" there, where it is inserted for the word "Conference," singular or plural?

Secretary Frank M. Thomas: Singular, so I understood. "The ministerial and lay members from the Regional Jurisdiction shall be chosen by their respective orders in the Regional Conference"—

Joseph W. Van Cleve: Let me substitute "each" instead of "the," so that it would read: "The ministerial and lay members from each Regional Jurisdiction shall be chosen," etc.

Frank Neff: Just move that up after the word "sessions," instead of where you are proposing to put it in, "chosen by their

respective orders at the session of the Regional Conference next preceding." I think that is better language.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): What does the mover say?

Joseph W. Van Cleve: I think that is better myself.

Abram W. Harris: I would like to inquire whether the committee has fully considered the effect of that expression "at the session next preceding"? As I understand, the expectation is that the Regional Conferences will meet during the session of the Annual Conference and at such other times as may be ordered. Can you not find a phraseology which will make it possible to elect these members without question during the General Conference?

Edgar Blake: I think the point made by Dr. Harris is very well taken and it should be considered, but it is not necessary to consider it now. If we pass this, we can then consider that.

Frank M. Thomas: I move to amend by striking out the word "orders" and putting in the word "classes."

Bishop Cooke: The committee would not be willing to do that. In our Discipline there is a "call for a vote by orders," and that word is a Methodist word very well understood and will create no objection and it carries out the traditions of the Church. The word "classes" is too much of a distinctive term and not at all acceptable to a majority of us because of associations. The word "orders" is purely a Church word, well understood. There is a ministerial order and a lay order.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): If you will allow me to speak from the chair, the word "orders" is one of the most technical words that we have ever had in ecclesiasticology. It has led to more disputes and differences in language and feeling than perhaps in meaning. We know how the Romanists regard orders. We actually have men in our Methodism who speak of two orders and one office or three orders, seeming not to know the meaning of the word "orders" in its historic sense. The existence of any order, no matter what that order may be, if the word be used in its historic meaning, confuses the significance as I do not think it ought to be done, and for that reason I believe it would be better to substitute some other word than the word "orders" in this place. To be sure, you say the order of laymen and the order of ministers, but the use of the word itself in this position would not be wise. I do not recall with sufficient clearness whether the word "orders" is used in our Discipline or not.

A. F. Watkins: Yes, it is used.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I think it is unfortunate, and this is a good time to get rid of it. I think some other word that is not so susceptible to misunderstanding should be used.

I do not believe we have in the distinctive historic meaning of the word "orders" any "orders" in Methodism.

Claudius B. Spencer: I hope that the idea advanced by Bishop Denny will prevail. The word applied to the laity is not particularly repugnant to me, believing, as I do, as much in the priesthood of the laity as of anybody; but I must say that, historically speaking, instead of the use of the word "order," as it applies in our polity, I would much prefer to have some such word as that introduced by Dr. Thomas inserted in this document. As I heard the section read, the word grated on me. I think this is a good time now to direct attention to the meaning of the word "order." I have not a Discipline with me, but I do not recall the word "order" applied to laymen as well as to ministers. While I believe, so to say, in the priesthood of the laity and in a very large recognition of the lay prerogative, identical almost with that of the ministry, it seems to me, at this particular point, we should be careful with the use of words. I have not given the matter enough thought in the last two or three minutes to suggest any word, but I hope another word will be found.

Abram W. Harris: I move as a substitute that it shall read as follows: "One shall be chosen by the ministers and laymen respectively."

C. M. Bishop: That is the only mode of making it clear.

Frank M. Thomas: I accept that.

H. M. Du Bose: The whole trouble arises through our shyness in the use of terms. We Protestants have generally kept close to words that are historic. Four years ago, when the matter of the Creed was up in our General Conference, the perennial question arose as to whether we should make the Creed read "The Church of God" or "The holy catholic Church." A large number took the position that the former reading should be established. A still smaller number took the position that we should insist upon the use of the word "catholic"; that we ought to claim it, since both its use and matter are historic. So also the word "orders" is bound up in many things that are essential and historically important. I believe we should retain it in our history and use it constantly in the proceedings of the General Conference. As applied here, it would not have the slightest hierarchical suggestion. As referring to the laity it could be but a harmless designation. For the laity there is no claim of orders. The term is merely a distinctive one, and yet is significant for its historic value and its general morale. As affecting the unity of the history of the Church, we should hold on to it.

A. F. Watkins: I feel in sympathy with the suggestion made by Dr. Thomas. I also indorse very strongly the stand of Bish-

op Cooke. I am so accustomed to the word "voting by orders"; I thought we had it down literally in our Discipline. But I find we "vote separately," so that I do not know that the phrase "vote by orders" is found in our Discipline, but it is on our tongues.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): So are many other things that are not in the Discipline.

A. F. Watkins: I think the suggestion of Dr. Harris will correct any objection that has been made by any one, and I do not think it is open to any objection itself.

Bishop Cooke: I deprecate very much the tendency to get away from Methodist terminology. When a word drops out of use, the thing which it represents is very apt also to drop out of use, the same way as a doctrine not preached soon becomes a dead letter. The word "order" is a Methodist word. It does not in this connection nor in any other connection in our Discipline nor in any Methodist literature from the very beginning carry with it any hierarchical notions or pretenses or suggestions. It is simply a word used to mean "classes." As for the priesthood of the laity, there is no such thing in any real sense. Of all the religions that have ever been on the face of the earth, the Christian religion is the only religion that never had priests. Priesthood carries with it the idea of sacrificial function. There is only one High Priest, Christ, and when we talk about priesthood of the laity we are opening the gates of Quakerism and all the other "isms" altogether contrary to the historic Church of God. So when we talk about "orders," suggesting this, that, and the other, it is a far-off conclusion. You vote in your Conferences for election by "orders." When you take a vote in a General Conference on a disputed question, you vote by "orders" and we do too, and when we get away from the words "orders" and substitute "class" we are making a very invidious distinction and one which is altogether unnecessary, because everybody understands the use of the word "orders" in our Discipline. We are getting away from the word "orders," and sometime ago we cut out the word "ordination" and injected the word "consecration," the very thing that John Wesley cut out from the Sunday service. We speak of consecration instead of ordination. Look at the usage of the Fathers of Methodism and see what the word meant. Coke says he "ordained" Asbury, and Asbury says he "ordained" McKendree. Let us keep the things that are historic.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: We have drifted a long way from the place we started. We are involving ourselves in difficulties trying to do everything in one paragraph.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): We are on an amendment to an amendment.

Joseph W Van Cleve: We were trying to adopt a section pertaining to the election of members to the Supreme Court, or Judicial Council. I think it would be better if this matter about the use of the word "orders" could be withdrawn and we fix it up that the members could be chosen from the Regional Jurisdiction at the Regional Conference, then we can take up the question of the word "orders" and settle it, and not confuse the two things.

David G. Downey: There is a motion to substitute "classes" for "orders."

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Yes, and to substitute "the same shall be chosen by the ministerial and lay members respectively."

David G. Downey: Words have not only a historic meaning, but they gather an acquired meaning through the years, and we have just as much right to the acquired meaning as to the historic meaning. Nothing is more common than change in the meaning of words, and we all know the meanings that they gather to themselves. When we use the word "orders," we do not necessarily take in the historic implication of all the ages. I believe we ought to use the word "orders" with reference to the laity and the ministry, not because it savors of prelacy, but rather because by using it with reference to the laity we take from it the prelatical significance. It is a good Methodist word, and while it is not in your Discipline—

John M. Moore: It is.

David G. Downey: I am glad to hear it is. We "vote by orders," and there is no question of understanding just what we mean, and it seems to me a good deal shorter and simpler than to be everlastingly repeating "clerical and lay."

A. J. Lamar: I move that the vote be now taken.

H. M. Du Bose: Mr. Chairman, I want to rise to a question of privilege.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): State the question, and be sure it is a question of privilege.

H. M. Du Bose: It involves the question of discipline. Paragraph 527 of the Discipline—

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Evidently an episcopal decision.

H. M. Du Bose: I think you can waive it. There the word is used: "A vote by orders cannot be demanded; . . . nor in the organization of a General Conference by the election of an officer nor in any election, but only touching legislative action."

A. F. Watkins: May I rise to a point of privilege?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): State it.

A. F. Watkins: It is a question of accuracy of my state-

ment that it was not found in the Discipline. You will find in the index that there is a reference to a "vote by orders."

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That was by Dr. Gross Alexander and that refers to Paragraph 35, which was read in your hearing. Now, the motion is practically for the previous question.

A. J. Lamar: That was the intent of my motion.

A vote being taken, the main question was ordered.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The whole matter is now before us and the question is, Will you write into this third section "shall be chosen by the ministerial and lay members, respectively"? If you adopt that, say "Aye."

The motion was lost by a vote of seventeen to twenty

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The next question is the amendment offered by Dr. Van Cleve: "The ministry and lay members from each Regional Jurisdiction shall be chosen by their respective orders in the Regional Conference."

Bishop Cooke: We accept that.

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

Abram W Harris: I move to strike out the words "next preceding" and substitute the word "during."

A. J. Lamar: Is that in order? We are under the previous question, and that carries us back to the original question, the report of the committee.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): We had two amendments; technically, you could thrust it forward to cover the whole section. Was that your purpose?

A. J. Lamar: I was acting according to our usage in the General Conference. When a demand for the previous question is made, it covers the whole thing back to the beginning.

C. M. Bishop: I seconded Dr Lamar's motion, and I certainly would not have seconded it if it had forced us to adopt the entire section when there were other amendments that were necessary.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): By unanimous consent we can consider Dr. Harris's amendment. Is there any objection? I hear none, and the amendment is before us.

Bishop McDowell: I rise to a question of order. What did that previous question cover?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The previous question covered the amendment and the original resolution, which was to adopt the section; but now, by unanimous consent, we are about to consider an amendment offered by Dr Harris. Now, what will you do with that amendment? We had better have the amendment.

Abram W Harris: The amendment is to strike out the words "next preceding" in the last line and insert instead "dur-

ing.” There is a provision that the Regional Conferences shall meet during the session of the General Conference. I suppose that will be reported and adopted and “at such other times,” etc., so that if it stands as it now reads it may be necessary to call a special meeting of a Regional Conference in order to elect these members.

Bishop Cooke: If you defer the election of men to such a responsible place as this until you meet at the General Conference, knowing as you all do the confusion and the amount of work that is placed upon the delegates to the General Conference, you will see what a bad time that will be for selecting men with judicial care from all over the Church for this office; and if you say it shall be during the General Conference, then you prevent the Regional Conference at any time except during the General Conference from doing the selecting. It would seem to me we could substitute some other word which would enable the Regional Conference to elect either before the General Conference or at the General Conference, but not limit it to the time of the General Conference.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Could you not strike out the whole clause, “shall be chosen by the respective orders in the Regional Conference,” without naming the time and leave that to the judgment of the Regional Conference itself?

Bishop Cooke: That would be all right.

C. M. Bishop: But you want to constitute the Council at the beginning of the General Conference.

Bishop Cooke: That can be done at any time.

David G. Downey: It is at the close of the General Conference.

Bishop Denny: I understand the motion of Dr. Harris is to strike out the words from the word “at” down to the word “Conference.”

Edgar Blake: I am not sure of that. It seems to me we ought to provide that these elections in the Regional Conferences should take place at practically the same time, in order that their confirmation may come at the same time. Therefore, their terms of office begin together.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): They would have to be confirmed at the General Conference.

Edgar Blake: I understand, but one Regional Conference might elect its delegates at its first session at the time the General Conference is in session.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): And it would not have any effect.

Edgar Blake: It would be confirmed.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Not by the General Conference then.

Edgar Blake: Let us see. Suppose the General Conference meets in 1920. The Regional Conferences will hold the first regular session immediately following the organization of that General Conference. At that time that Regional Conference elects its representatives on this Judicial Council. They would be confirmed by the General Conference of 1920. Now, suppose the Regional Conference should not elect its representatives in the Judicial Council at that time, but should elect their delegates or representatives following the General Conference. Then their delegates could not be confirmed until the General Conference of 1924.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): They would lose their representation, and that is their lookout.

Edgar Blake: It is the lookout of the Church. We want to keep this body filled.

Frank M. Thomas: Did you ever hear of a Methodist body failing to elect?

Edgar Blake: I have known, as you brethren have known, of several Methodist bodies failing to elect, not because of a want of a desire to elect, but because of a deadlock. It seems to me we shall be in a far better position if we provide that such election shall take place at the first regular session of the Regional Conference.

Abram W. Harris: It seems to me you cannot prevent inaction on the part of the General Conference by any provision. The same thing will happen and may happen if you put in a provision that it shall be done at a particular time.

David G. Downey: I want to offer an alternative. It reads as follows: "The ministerial and lay members from each Regional Jurisdiction shall be chosen by their respective orders at its session next preceding or during the General Conference." Will not that do? That is, if they had a meeting immediately preceding, which is the thought we had in mind, they could elect then. If they don't have a meeting to elect immediately preceding, they will have one during the General Conference and will elect then. I do not know that that covers the point, but I offer it.

The substitute was seconded by several.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Now, Brother Blake, may I call attention to this? that the Regional Conference elected to begin its term of service at the General Conference of 1920 will continue as the Regional Conference of each Jurisdiction until the end of the General Conference of 1924. Therefore, if we give the Regional Conference the power to elect before or preceding the session of the General Conference, it is the work of the old Regional Conference.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: That happens every time we have an election.

Bishop McDowell: It is the Regional Conference that is expiring.

Abram W Harris: There seems to be this very serious objection, to have the election made at the first session of the Regional Conference that may happen immediately after the adjournment of the General Conference of 1920. There is a new Council just gone into office. It might be perfectly clear before the end of the quadrennium that the men elected in 1920 ought not to be reelected, but it would not be clear in 1920, because putting off to that time would seem to require the election for the quadrennium. The election should be at the end of the term and not at the beginning.

R. E. Blackwell: These Regional Conferences are going to show some sense. These men are not going to hurry out among their friends and get themselves elected when that excludes them from the General Conference. A man is going to stay at the General Conference as long as he can.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Will the Secretary tell us what is before us?

Secretary Frank M. Thomas: Dr. Downey moved as an amendment to the amendment, to make the clause read, "At its session next preceding or during the General Conference."

C. M. Bishop: I would like to raise a question for some one to answer. Does the present motion provide for the possible election in the one case "next preceding the General Conference" by a Jurisdictional Conference elected long before; and in the other case the election by another Jurisdictional Conference only recently elected? If so, we do not want to provide that.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: It would be the same Regional Conference.

C. M. Bishop: When are the members of the Regional Conference to be elected? Are they not to be elected as members of the General Conference? and the Jurisdictional Conference holds over until the succeeding one is elected. If we adopt this, will the members of the Judicial Council be elected before the General Conference or during the General Conference? Do we want to elect by the Jurisdictional Conference elected four years before or by the Jurisdictional Conference elected now? There is a distinction there that we ought to measure the weight of before we put through this amendment. I am opposed to the amendment with my present understanding of it.

Abram W Harris: I want to ask a question. The proposal is that the election shall be made at the session "next preceding." How will anybody know if the session before the General Conference is the next preceding? A provision is made that the meeting shall be held during the General Conference or at some

other time. Suppose we have a session halfway through the quadrennium and elections are made then. Then there is another unexpected but regular meeting held three-fourths of the way through the quadrennium and still other elections are made then. Which are the elections that control?

Bishop Cooke: What does this amendment of Dr. Downey's provide for? It provides simply for an option, that the Regional Conference may elect its members preceding the meeting of the General Conference or it may defer that election until it meets during the General Conference. Now, that is in perfect keeping with what we do in electing members as delegates to the General Conference throughout the whole of Methodism. Not all are elected at the same time, and this leaves it optional with the Regional Conference to elect now or wait until they get into the General Conference. So that whatever may be said against it can be said equally against every other kind of a proposition. It is an equally valid argument on both sides, only this has the advantage that it leaves it optional with the Conference whether to elect now or during the General Conference.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Would not striking out all reference to it do the same thing?

C. M. Bishop: The Jurisdictional Conference that would elect these members preceding the General Conference is composed of a different set of men from those who would represent the same jurisdiction during the General Conference.

David G. Downey: Is the Regional Conference changed?

C. M. Bishop: It is by election.

David G. Downey: Do you mean to say that, the representatives of the Regional Conferences having elected members of the Council, just as soon as the new men were elected to the General Conference they would strive to dispossess those previously elected? My point is that the Regional Conference continues, although the personnel changes.

C. M. Bishop: But this practical question would at least arise, that the Jurisdictional Conference elected in 1916 and continuing in membership in the Jurisdictional Conference until 1920 might, if they chose to do so, and they might have some interest in doing so, hold a meeting of the Jurisdictional Conference one week before the General Conference assembles and elect members to the Judicial Council, and the newly elected members of the General Conference who constituted the members of the Jurisdictional Conference would, therefore, be deprived of certain rights. It is then a question of whether the old members shall elect, as they have a right to, or whether they shall do the courtesy to the new members of allowing them to elect, and it is a question around which there will arise practical political trouble.

Bishop Cooke: Will the new members elected to the General Conference have any right they have not already exercised in the General Conference?

David G. Downey: No member of the Judicial Council is a member until confirmed by the General Conference. Now, if such a thing as Dr. Bishop suggests should happen—to wit, that the personnel of one Regional Conference going out of the office should meet and elect during the General Conference—then it would be a matter for the General Conference to determine which of the members elected should be confirmed. The matter would be cared for there in the General Conference. I do not know that this is the best thing, but I am trying to help out the clause.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Would it not be a question simply of the nomination of certain officers and could not that be withdrawn and others substituted?

W. N. Ainsworth: The word “option” has been used in this connection, but clearly the only body that could exercise an option would be the delegates from the Regional Jurisdiction whose term is about to expire. They might, as under the statement of the proposition they would have a right to exercise this option. There would be no option left to the incoming jurisdiction of delegates who are to constitute the Regional Conference for the next succeeding four years. It is therefore a mistake to indicate an option and yet shut off the exercise of the option to delegates whose terms are about to expire.

Bishop Cooke: I am a little stupid, possibly a good deal, but I cannot understand for the life of me why there should be so much argument about such a simple proposition. Suppose this body is a Regional Conference to-day. The General Conference will meet three months from now. This Regional Conference elects its quota to the Judicial Council for confirmation by the General Conference which will meet three months hence. Now, when we come to the General Conference, who has a right to set aside that election? No one has a right to do it. These men are elected. What right is left? A right of protest against their confirmation. But, if this Regional Conference elects its quota to the Judicial Council, those men are elected. We can say we will not elect to-day, we will elect at our meeting during the General Conference. Very well, that is an end of it. So that the election is put off until the General Conference meets. That is the whole case. This leaves it optional with the Regional Conferences whether to elect now or during the General Conference. That is all there is to it. I hope that is clear.

E. B. Chappell: I cannot see any benefit from all this debate. In the first place, why should the expiring membership of the Regional Conference elect its Judicial Council?

C. M. Bishop: We do not.

E. B. Chappell: Why should that be put in there at all? In the second place, the argument about the time raised and all that is of no value simply because of the fact that the Regional Conference will do its work right there at the session of the General Conference.

C. M. Bishop: But not according to this.

E. B. Chappell: I am asking why there is any necessity for putting in the words "next preceding" at all. The matter is perfectly clear, if Doctor Harris will maintain his first amendment, and that is what I think he should do. "During the session of the General Conference," that is the time the Regional Conference is going to meet and transact all its business. The probabilities are it will not meet during the quadrennium except on rare occasions.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I rise to back up Dr. Bishop and I rise to do so on the very thing that this Commission has already done. Let me read two paragraphs from the report of the Committee on Conferences, which were approved at Traverse City. Apparently Dr. Chappell has not read them. The first is:

Each Regional Conference shall be composed of the ministerial and lay delegates elected to the General Conference by the several Annual Conferences within the territory of the said Regional Conference.

Therefore, we know that by the action of this Commission the Regional Conference membership consists of the membership in the General Conference, then we have this:

Each Regional Conference shall meet for organization immediately succeeding the General Conference and at such other times and places as the Regional Conference shall determine.

That "at such other times and places" cannot have reference to before the meeting, but would be immediately succeeding the organization of the General Conference. It does not seem to me there is the slightest difficulty. If Dr. Harris's first motion is allowed to prevail, every member of the General Conference is going to try to get there, and they come in as members of the General Conference and of the Regional Conference. There is no difficulty, as Bishop Cooke suggested a while ago, of calling a meeting for the election of ministerial and lay delegates during the meeting of the General Conference. It may be done the first, second, or third day of the General Conference, before the General Conference is down to its work. We have the members of the General Conference there and they are the members of the Regional Conferences and why not let them meet on such a day of the General Conference as is satisfactory to them and go

through the duty of electing members to the Judicial Council? It is easy to say that the General Conference will settle that, but you don't want to bring the controversy before the General Conference. Suppose you have one hundred members, do you want fifty-one to come and say we want Smith, Jones, Brown, and Robinson, and forty-nine to come in and say we want Clark, Thompson, Harris, and Johnson? If you leave that as Dr. Harris's first motion was, that that election take place during the session of the General Conference, you have avoided all the difficulty that has been suggested here.

David G. Downey: I withdraw my motion.

Frank M. Thomas: Then Dr. Harris having changed his first motion, I move to renew Dr. Harris's original motion.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): What was the original motion, "During the session of the General Conference"?

Frank M. Thomas: Yes.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Then the motion is to insert here "during the session of the General Conference."

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: I move that the section as amended be adopted. Now, we struck out the "such" and say "this election being by ballot and the members shall be subject to confirmation by the General Conference."

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Now, let me read this as I think it is, and the Secretaries will have to assist me:

The ministerial and lay members from each Regional Jurisdiction shall be chosen by their respective orders in the Regional Conference during the session of the General Conference, said election being by ballot. These members shall be subject to confirmation by the General Conference.

That seems to me what we have adopted in the way of amendment so far.

A vote being taken, the section was agreed to.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): We will now take up Section 4.

The section was read, as follows:

Members of the Council shall serve for four years, subject to reëlection. The term of service of each member, except in the case provided in Section 10, shall expire at the close of the General Conference succeeding that at which his term began.

A. J. Lamar: By my time we are within five minutes of adjournment.

T. D. Samford: I move that we make it read, "that they shall serve for four years, or until their successors are elected and confirmed."

Bishop Cooke: That is the law, and we have no objection to it.

Rolla V Watt: Have the entire section read with the changes. We want no mistake.

Thereupon the section was read, as follows:

Members of the Council shall serve for four years, or until their successors are elected and confirmed, subject to reelection. The term of service of each member, except in the case provided in Section 10, shall expire at the close of the General Conference succeeding that at which his term began.

Rolla V Watt: That will carry him over two General Conferences.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): In case there should be some failure to elect, under the motion of Mr. Samford, the men would hold over until the new election and confirmation.

Joseph W Van Cleve: It seems to me it would be a good thing to provide some way after the first election so that all the members of this Judicial Council should not be elected at any one General Conference. It may be impossible for the General Conference to elect.

E. B. Chappell: The General Conference doesn't elect.

Joseph W Van Cleve: Virtually it elects. The same persons do. If the Judicial Council were all elected at one time, the Supreme Court could be reconstituted in such a way as to permit the General Conference to review its own work. I think we should arrange to have one-half of them elected at each succeeding General Conference, so that it will take eight years to reconstitute the Supreme Court; then continuity of action will be secured and you would have all the time half of the Council which has had experience in the work.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I beg your pardon, but you will have to make a motion to go further.

A. J. Lamar: The committee recognized the importance of the very thing you are speaking of and we adopted it by and large by our thoroughly looking at all phases, but we did not see how to arrange it so that one-half would hold over. We greatly preferred that one-half should hold over. Personally, we preferred that two-thirds should hold over and that each quadrennium should elect one-third, but we couldn't see how we could arrange it that way.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Did you try to work it out by allowing the laymen to serve eight years and then the ministers to serve eight years?

Joseph W Van Cleve: I move that at the first election the laymen shall serve for eight years and that thereafter the vacancy shall be filled for eight years by the General Conference.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Understand, brothers, Dr. Van Cleve's motion is that at the first General Conference the

lay members of the Judicial Council shall be elected for eight years and at the second election the ministerial members shall be elected for eight years.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: That will not do.

Bishop Cooke: May I, without infringing on parliamentary law, suggest, since this matter is of importance and we have time to fully discuss it between now and the expiration of the session, that we defer it?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): You can cover a motion to adjourn.

Edgar Blake: In order that this matter can be handled properly, would it not be better, instead of deferring, to recommit it to the committee? I move that Section 4 be recommitted.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Dr. Van Cleve's amendment is really not an amendment to Section 4, but it should be to Section 3. If it is meant by his motion to refer to Section 3, that will accomplish it without raising any technical point.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): This could be recommitted to the committee with the understanding that they will bring it in in connection with any section to which it relates.

The motion to defer, being put to a vote, was declared carried.

Bishop Mouzon: I move that the order of the day this afternoon immediately after the reading of the minutes be the taking up of the report of the Committee on the Status of the Negro Membership in the Reorganized Church.

The motion was seconded.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That is a matter for the Commission.

Bishop Cooke: I move as a substitute, since we have this other report before us and our minds are upon it and we have the run of it, that we should get through with it. It will not take much longer to finish this report and then we shall have it out of the way. To sidetrack it now and then to have it come back before us with our minds diverted to something else would not do at all.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): You will have to extend the time or you will be cut off by the adjourning time.

On motion duly made and seconded, the time was extended until Bishop Mouzon's motion could be disposed of.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Bishop Mouzon's motion is before you that the order of the day this afternoon be the report of the Committee on the Status of the Negro. Are you ready for the question?

Bishop Cooke: There was a substitute that we continue and finish the report we are now on.

C. M. Bishop: I raise the point of order whether that is a substitute. All you have to do is really to vote down Bishop

Mouzon's motion, and that other would come as a matter of course.

Rolla V. Watt: It is admitted by everybody that this is the most important question to be disposed of by this Commission, and there are two members, one on each Commission, who are not here, but are on their way here and will be here tonight. I think Bishop Mouzon's motion should be voted down until they get in.

Bishop Cranston: I move as an amendment that the report of the Committee on the Status of the Negro be the order of the day to-morrow morning immediately after the minutes.

The motion was seconded.

Bishop Mouzon: I will accept that.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Then it becomes the original motion and we will take the vote on that.

A vote being taken, the motion was carried.

W. N. Ainsworth made various announcements.

The hymn, "Children of the Heavenly King," was sung, Bishop Collins Denny pronounced the benediction, and the session adjourned.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Joint Commission was called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Collins Denny.

The hymn, "Blest be the tie that binds," was sung.

Dr. E. B. Chappell read the thirteenth chapter of 1 Corinthians and then offered prayer.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): In the South it is customary for the President of the session to continue in the chair until the minutes of that session are approved. I have taken the chair on that basis, and I ask the Secretary to read the minutes of the last meeting.

The minutes of the last session were read, corrected, and approved.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I do not ask for the calling of the roll, but now turn the chair over to Bishop Cranston.

Bishop Earl Cranston took the chair.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Secretary will please call the roll.

The roll was called and the following were present: Bishops Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. B. Murrah, James Atkins, Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, R. J. Cooke. Ministers: F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. F. Watkins, A. J. Lamar, Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. W. Van Cleve, J. J. Wallace, C. M. Stuart (reserve). Laymen: M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder,

P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, H. W. Rogers, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock.

Bishop Denny: As a matter of fact, the roll should have been called before the reading of the minutes, and I beg pardon for that omission. May I make a matter of record this fact: Bishop Candler is not at all well. He came here only at the unanimous request of the Southern Commission and on condition that he should not put his health in jeopardy. He is not able to come out this afternoon, and I would like it to be noted that his absence is due to the fact that he is not well and he, as well as the members of our Commission, has asked me to take his duties in the Chair.

Bishop McDowell: I think it ought to be agreed that at any time Bishop Candler desires to have his vote recorded on any matter on which we are voting, even though he may not be present in the session, he shall have the privilege to have his vote recorded just as if he were present in the session, and I think that should apply to any other member of either Commission who is away on account of illness.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: But suppose it should change the result?

Bishop McDowell: He has made the journey here for the purpose of being at our sessions, and if he is detained at the hotel by illness I still think that his vote should be recorded if he desires it.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: You could not know on a close vote whether to proceed or not.

Edgar Blake: How do we know that the member wants to vote? He may vote and overturn everything. When we come to the final vote by Commissions, then the member ought to be permitted to vote.

Bishop McDowell: That was all I meant. I do not mean on these tentative approvals.

Edgar Blake: Then that is covered all right.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): There is no motion before the house.

The Secretary read a communication from B. W. Mozier; also a telegram from Hutchinson, Kans., greetings of the First and Second Methodist Episcopal Churches of Hutchinson; also a telegram from W. H. Henby; also a letter from Greater Kansas City.

Claudius B. Spencer: In order to make the record plain, I would like to have it stated that I was prevented by a snow blockade from being here on yesterday morning.

Edwin M. Randall: For the same reason I want it made a matter of record that I was detained by a wreck of my train.

Frank Neff: I always take pride in being on time, and I started twelve hours earlier than necessary to get here, but I was twelve hours late when I got here.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Now, we will proceed with the consideration of the report of the Committee on Judicial Council. The Secretary will read the next item.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: The next item was Section 4, which was referred back to the committee for redrafting, and we should have a report from the committee as the result of their action.

Bishop Cooke: Dr. Downey will present the report.

Edgar Blake: I understood Dr. Watkins to refer to the last sentence of Section 3. I want to call that up, and I ask unanimous consent for that to be done.

A. F. Watkins: I have reconsidered the matter and do not wish to offer an amendment.

David G. Downey: This is Section 4, which was recommitted to the committee. We have tried to divide the Council into two classes, so that the terms of service will not expire at the same time. We have had to assume that the Regional Conferences would be numbered odd and even, or if not they will be characterized in some other way that can be differentiated:

Sec. 4. Term of Service.—Members of the Council shall serve for eight years, or until their successors are confirmed. They shall be eligible for reelection. Except as herein otherwise provided, the term of service of each member shall expire at the close of the second General Conference succeeding that at which his term began; provided, that the terms of the first members of the Judicial Council shall expire at the close of the first General Conference succeeding that at which their term began.

That simply means that the terms of the members elected by the odd numbered Regional Conferences shall run for four years and thereafter all the members shall be elected for eight years, but their terms would expire alternately. I call attention to the fact that there is nothing here as to the term of those elected by the General Conference unless you make some further provision. The three elected by the General Conference will always serve eight years. If you desire to have them serve only for four, it is easy to provide that the members elected by the General Conference shall serve for four years. As it is now they serve for eight years. I move the adoption of this.

J. H. Reynolds: I think it is unfortunate that the terms of all the representatives from a district expire at the same time. I believe it would be better to have two from each district hold over and the other be elected. I move that after the first term the laymen from the odd districts shall serve but four years and the

ministerial representatives from the even numbered districts shall serve but four years.

The motion was seconded.

David G. Downey: If I understand that, it would practically result in the ministerial delegates' terms of service always expiring at one time and the laymen's terms of service always expiring at one time, which I think would be unfortunate.

Edwin M. Randall: No, I beg pardon. Under that provision one-half of the terms of the ministerial and lay members would expire at each Conference.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: What was the trouble with the report of the committee in that regard?

Edwin M. Randall: The only objection I have is this: Under the report of the committee both of the representatives of a district would close their terms at the same time. Under the change I propose two of the men representing a district would always hold over.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I undersand that; but what is gained in your change?

Edwin M. Randall: One district would always have an experienced man representing it in the Council.

David G. Downey: Those are all subject to reëlection. I think we can trust to the general good sense of the Region, and this proviso is perfectly clear as to its application to a certain number of the Regional Conferences for the first Judicial Council and thereafter everything is equitable. I think the fact that the terms of the members of the odd numbered Regional Conferences expire at the end of four years and that said members may thereafter immediately be reëlected for eight years meets all objections.

Edwin M. Randall: The considerations upon which I base the amendments I propose are those precisely that have disposed this body to so arrange that that Council may not have a re-election of its entire membership every four years. The same reason exists why the terms of only half of that Council shall expire in order that the body may be assured of the holding over of one-half. Every consideration in favor of that is in favor of there being one experienced man from each Regional Conference held over. We could say that the terms should be four years and a reëlection every four years and trust to the good sense of the Regions to reëlect. The same argument holds against the provision of the committee that would hold against my amendment.

A vote being taken, the amendment of Dr. Randall was agreed to.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Read the section as re-

ported by Dr. Downey and then read the amendment of Dr. Randall.

The section as reported by Rev David G. Downey was read, as follows:

Members of the Council shall serve for eight years, or until their successors are confirmed. They shall be eligible for reelection. Except as herein otherwise provided, the term of service of each member shall expire at the close of the second General Conference succeeding that at which his term began; provided, that the terms of the first members of the Judicial Council shall expire at the close of the first General Conference succeeding that at which their term began.

The amendment of Rev Edwin M. Randall was read, as follows:

That for the first term laymen from the odd numbered districts shall serve for four years and ministerial representatives from the even numbered districts shall serve for four years.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The meaning is clear, but perhaps it will have to be worked over.

John M. Moore: As I understand this article each man is to serve eight years from the time he was elected.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Except the first.

John M. Moore: Suppose a man is elected for eight years and at the end of three years is removed by death or otherwise?

David G. Downey: There is a clause later on that bears on that.

John M. Moore: Is it provided that appointments are to last only to the end of that man's term?

David G. Downey: Yes, there is a provision for filling vacancies.

Edgar Blake: There are one or two matters that are difficult to get at without referring the report. In paragraph six I find:

The members of the Judicial Council shall convene at the close of the General Conference following their election, and shall organize after their confirmation by the General Conference by choosing from their number a President and Secretary for the ensuing quadrennium.

That is to say, the term of office of the members of the Council does not begin until the close of the session of the General Conference which elects or confirms. Now, it would seem to be desirable that at the first General Conference the term of office of the members of the Council should begin upon their election or confirmation by the General Conference. That would seem to be necessary and I think ought to be provided for. If we provide that the members of the Council shall serve for eight years, their term of office to begin at the close of the session of the General Conference at which they were elected or confirmed and to continue until the close of the session of the second succeeding General Conference, except as provided

in Section 10, that would be all right, but the term of service of the members of the first Judicial Council should begin at the time of their election and confirmation by the General Conference.

Frank M. Thomas: Could it not be cured by inserting in Section 6 that the members of the Judicial Council with the exception of the first, etc.?

Edgar Blake: What I want is that we shall make it perfectly clear that in the first Judicial Council session the term of service of the members shall begin at the time of their election and confirmation.

E. B. Chappell: Then move that that be inserted.

Edgar Blake: No, it is a matter of editing.

Bishop Cooke: That would necessitate the General Conference confirming these men the first or second day.

Edgar Blake: Just as soon as it can be done, in order that cases may come before that body.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Usually any time during the first week.

Edgar Blake: It would make it perfectly clear.

Bishop Cooke: We understood that in the committee.

Edgar Blake: It is not clear in the report, and it should be made so.

Bishop Cooke: But they should continue until the close of the first—

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): This is a matter so patent that we ought not to waste a minute in discussing it. It seems to me the discussion is unnecessary.

Edgar Blake: I was about to move that the suggestion be referred to the committee for editing.

Bishop Cooke: We will adopt that.

David G. Downey: Would not that matter come in better under "Organization"?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): No, if you will pardon me for answering.

A vote being taken, the motion to refer was carried.

E. B. Chappell: That does not mean that this shall come back to us; it is a mere matter of editing.

Bishop Denny: It will have to come back to be recorded.

Edgar Blake: I move as an amendment that we add the words "Provided, however, that the term of service of the first members of the Judicial Council shall begin at the time of their election or confirmation by the General Conference."

Bishop Cooke: That matter was referred to the committee for editing. The committee is ready to report, and reports recommending the adoption of the amendment just offered by Dr. Blake.

C. M. Bishop: I move that the report of the committee be accepted.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Subject to a rewriting, and just leave the matter to be recorded according to the facts. Dr. Blake presented this amendment, and it was accepted by Bishop Cooke, of the committee, and we will have it reported back from the committee.

Bishop Cooke: But the committee is ready to report it back and has reported.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The duty of the committee is to give the clause intelligent reading.

Secretary A. W. Harris: May I read the article as it was amended by Dr. Randall?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): For information of the Commission Dr. Harris will read the article as it reads after the adoption of the amendment of Dr. Randall.

Secretary A. W. Harris: I will begin at the proviso. That reads:

Except that the terms of the lay members of the first Judicial Council elected by the odd numbered Regional Conference and the ministerial representatives elected by the even numbered districts expire at the close of the first General Conference succeeding that at which their term began.

David G. Downey: And what Dr. Blake offered can come right there, "and provided further," etc.

Abram W. Harris: That word "districts" is not a good word.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Will the Secretary read it again and read the whole thing?

Secretary A. W. Harris (Reading):

(4) Members of the Council shall serve for eight years, or until their successors are confirmed. They shall be eligible for reelection. Except as herein otherwise provided, the term of service of each member shall expire at the close of the second General Conference succeeding that at which his term began, except that the term of lay members of the first Judicial Council elected by the odd numbered Regional Conferences and the ministerial representatives elected by the even numbered Regional Conferences, shall expire at the close of the first General Conference succeeding that of the members of the first Judicial Council shall begin at the time of their election or confirmation.

Edgar Blake: I want to call attention to a matter that comes in at the very beginning of the court. "Members of the Council shall serve for eight years, or until their successors are confirmed." Now there are two classes of members in the Judicial Council. One class is elected by the Regional Conference and confirmed by the General Conference. The other class is elected by the General Conference.

Abram W. Harris: You say "election" or "confirmation."

That might mean that they might serve from the time of the election, although not confirmed.

Edgar Blake: We want to make it so that it cannot be misunderstood.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): It seems to me that we should recommit that. The second proviso I don't think is in exactly the right form. It ought to start the other way. The first Judicial Council shall serve until the close of the next General Conference, etc., and then go ahead and provide for your first Judicial Council and avoid one of the provisos and then after that let it go just as the amended item indicates.

Abram W. Harris: I move that this matter be recommitted for rewriting.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Are we ready for the next item? Read item five, please.

The Secretary read the item, as follows:

Ministerial and lay members of the Council shall not be eligible to membership in the General or Quadrennial Conference; nor shall they hold any other connectional office, nor serve on any connectional board of the Church during such term. No member of the Council shall hear, review, or determine any case before the Judicial Council to which he may be in any way related, nor shall he sit in the Council while such case is being examined.

Bishop Cooke: I move the adoption of that section.

The motion was seconded.

Bishop Cooke: The word "Quadrennial" will have to be changed to "Regional."

Abram W. Harris: I want to inquire the meaning of the word "such," "during *such* term"?

Bishop Cooke: The word "such" means that term in which the person is serving.

Abram W. Harris: There is no reference to terms at all in this article. That "such" should be changed.

Bishop Cooke: In the preceding section, No. 4, it closes with the words "at which his term began." Then Section 5 goes on:

Lay and ministerial members of the Council shall not be eligible to membership in the General or Regional Conferences; nor shall they hold any other connectional office, nor serve on any connectional board of the Church during such term.

That refers to the term above, for which he is serving or for which he is elected. However, we have no objection to substituting the word "his" for "such," and let it read "during his term."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): What are you talking about?

Bishop Cooke: The third line of paragraph five.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Are you moving to amend?

Abram W. Harris: I move to amend by changing that "during such term" so as to read "during their term of office."

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

John F. Goucher: I move to amend by striking out the words "ministerial and lay" and inserting so that it will read, "No member of the Council shall be eligible to membership in the General or Regional Conferences," etc.

Frank M. Thomas: Suppose a man were a member of the Judicial Council and the Council wished to elect him to the General Conference. According to this, he would not be eligible.

John F. Goucher: He would not be eligible.

Frank M. Thomas: He would have to resign first. That is an important question in several States to-day.

John F. Goucher: A man cannot be in two States at the same time.

Frank M. Thomas: I don't think because a man holds one office you should bar him from another if you want to elect him to it.

John F. Goucher: It does not change the sense of the clause which I am proposing.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Wouldn't it be better to put the words "The members of the Council shall not be eligible," etc.?

Rolla V. Watt: I agree with that. Why should we not say, "Members of the Council shall not be eligible," etc.?

Frank M. Thomas: Suppose a man is serving an eight-year term on the Judicial Council and his Regional Conference wants to elect him to the General Conference, why should not that be permitted? I don't think that the fact that a man is serving an eight-year term on a Judicial Council should be a bar to his being elected to the General Conference.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: There is a condition that is not covered by this change, and it seems to me it should be covered. So far as this section goes, it appears to me that a member of a General or Regional Conference might be elected a member of the Judicial Council by the Regional Conference of which he was a member. That should not be. No body should be permitted to elect one of its own members to a judicial body which will largely pass upon questions that will come before it. Therefore, I move as an amendment after the word "term" in the third line that we add the words, "No member of the General or Regional Conference shall during his term of service be eligible to membership in the Judicial Council."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Where would that come in?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: After the word "term" in the third line.

Bishop Denny: The words "term of service" close that section. Now what is your point?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: "The point is that no member of a General or Regional Conference should, during his term of service, be eligible for membership in the Judicial Council.

Bishop Denny: I see your point, and it is a good one.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: That is to prevent the General Conference from electing one of its own members to the Judicial Council, which may act on matters involving the acts of the General Conference.

Edgar Blake: How about membership on the connectional boards?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: That applies afterwards.

Edgar Blake: No, it comes in right there. What about that?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: We will leave that as it is.

Bishop Denny: I second Mr. Simpson's amendment.

Rolla V. Watt: Suppose Dr. Du Bose were elected by the General Conference. Now, you are organizing the Judicial Council at the first meeting of your Regional Jurisdiction and he is elected to the Supreme Court. Then he has to resign from the Judicial Council. Therefore, we should disfranchise all the men likely to be sent there as representatives.

Bishop Denny: I have observed that nobody needs to make clear what Brother Simpson says. He makes it perfectly clear himself, but I should like to repeat in my own words just what his point was. Here is a General Conference about to elect members to the Judicial Council. They may choose from their own membership men for positions on that Judicial Council. Those men may have been the leading men in the passage of certain actions by that General Conference, and therefore, when they go on the Judicial Council, they pass on the constitutionality of the things that they have already urged or passed. Brother Simpson's purpose is to take away from such men the possibility of being legislators at one session and judges of the constitutionality of their legislative acts at another session.

Bishop Cooke: That very matter was brought before the committee. You will remember that a few moments ago this body changed the time of the beginning of service, not to the close but at the beginning, and that those men should be elected or confirmed at the beginning of the General Conference, so that there would be no legislation before the General Conference upon which those men would act. Of course, if the election or confirmation of a man who is a member of the General Conference should be deferred until the second or third week of the

General Conference, then the objection that Mr. Simpson makes would prevail. Some of us went over that very carefully, but as you determined a while ago that the election of the Judicial Council shall take place at the beginning of the General Conference, any objection on that ground would fail. However, if that is not fixed, then the objection of Mr. Simpson does prevail.

E. C. Reeves: We understand it now. Let us vote on it and go on.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): When the brethren are ready to vote, I shall be glad to take the vote.

Edgar Blake: Can we have the section read as it will stand?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Secretary will please read the section.

The section was read, as follows:

Section 5. Members of the Council shall not be eligible to membership in the General or Regional Conferences, nor shall they hold any other connectional office nor serve on any connectional board of the Church during the term of service. No member of the General or Regional Conferences shall, during his term of service, be eligible to membership in the Judicial Council. No member of the Council shall here review or determine any case before the Judicial Council to which he may be in any way related, nor shall he sit in the Council while such a case is being examined.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Now, the amendment, please.

The Secretary read as follows:

No member of a General or Regional Conference shall, during his term of service, be eligible to membership in the Judicial Council.

Frank M. Thomas: Is not that clause stated in the opening clause?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: No, sir; it is not covered anywhere else.

Edgar Blake: "Shall not be eligible to election"—that is what we are after.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Yes.

Edgar Blake: But you do not say it. It should be "election" then. For instance, a man's membership in the Judicial Council does not begin until he is confirmed or elected by the General Conference. That makes it possible for a member of the General Conference to be elected, but not assume his term until the close of the session of the General Conference. I understood Mr. Simpson's point to be the possibility of electing members of the General Conference or Regional Conference to this Judicial Council.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: Simply to change the word "membership" to "election" would make it clear.

Abram W. Harris: Shall that be changed by common consent?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): If the Commission understands it.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Bishop Denny and I can accept it. He seconded my motion.

T. D. Samford: I will not give unanimous consent, because I do not think there is anything in the reason for the amendment the author offers, certainly not by analogy with our civil court. It is not anything unusual at all to appoint or to elect a member of a legislative body to a judgeship where he will have to pass upon an act of that legislative body. Of course, he will vacate his position as a member of the legislative body after he qualifies as a judicial officer; but that does not disqualify him at all from passing in a judicial way upon every act of that legislative body. It is not an unusual thing at all to appoint or elect a member of the State legislature to a judicial office nor to appoint a member of the United States Senate or member of Congress to a Federal judicial position. So I do not think that the reason Bishop Denny gives why Mr. Simpson's amendment is right would obtain. I see no good reason for the amendment.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: May I reply to Mr. Samford? He is entirely in error as to his facts. This is unfortunate, but it is true. It is true there is nothing in the Constitution of the United States forbidding that thing, but it was the cause of scandals which rose out of that identical thing. Some forty years ago in the Constitution of the State of Illinois they put in a provision which forbade any member of the legislature from being appointed to any judgeship in the State during the term of office for which he was elected. And, so far as I know (and I am well posted on that thing), there has not been any constitutional convention of any other State in this union which has met since that day but that has put that provision in its organic law. There may be exceptions, but they are rare indeed, and it is in order to avoid just such scandals as arose by reason of the President's appointing his henchmen in Congress and the Governors from appointing their henchmen in the legislature to judicial offices that this has been put into so many Constitutions of the States; and as we are endeavoring to avoid the least appearance of evil, certainly we ought not to hesitate in doing it in this matter.

T. D. Samford: This is a more accurate statement on that subject, and that is that no member of a legislature shall be appointed to a judicial office created by that legislature.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: A few of them read that way, but nearly all of them go the whole length.

T. D. Samford: I am not familiar with all of them, but I am familiar with the Constitution of my State and the Constitu-

tion of the United States. The Federal judge of my own district was appointed to that office while he was a member of Congress, and I know of several other similar instances. And I do not know of any scandals that have arisen on that account, so far as the Federal judiciary is concerned. I have no pride of opinion on the subject. I only do not see any good reason for it so far as the question of passing upon the constitutionality of legislative acts that they participate in.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Is the Commission ready to vote on the amendment?

Joseph W. Van Cleve: I see the particular feature to which Mr. Simpson and Bishop Denny have alluded, and yet that thing is rather far-reaching. We adopted a position at the beginning to secure a Regional Conference power to go outside of its own membership. We are now providing a regulation which compels them to go outside of their own membership. A man while he is a member shall not be eligible to this Judicial Council. Then the Regional Conferences must go outside of their membership to find the men. I hardly think that is necessary.

W. N. Ainsworth: Could a man resign if elected?

Rolla V. Watt: No, that would not do.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: All the objectionable features would still be there.

Rolla V. Watt: I dislike to differ with Mr. Simpson—I have such a high regard for his opinions, especially on a proposition of this sort—but I am looking at it from the standpoint of the welfare of the Church. Here is a large body of men whose constituents will want to send some of them to the General Conference. They will hardly be in a position to say, “We won’t send them to the General Conference, because we are going to elect them to the Judicial Council.” If they do that, they may be left at home and not get to serve in either. I do not want men like Mr. Simpson and Judge Pollock and Judge Rogers—and I suppose there is just as fine a list on the other side—to be in jeopardy of not serving the Church in any capacity when they are so valuable in serving the Church in almost any capacity. It seems to me the only chance is on the first Judicial Council, and just for the first election we might have to elect some man who has been a member; but the provision is that we shall elect him at the beginning of the Conference and that is before any legislation has been enacted, and while there may be a theoretical objection there is no practical objection.

E. C. Reeves: This amendment is in full accord with the action of the legislature of my State, which has just cleared away a lot of corruption that we had down there. I do heartily approve it and I hope you will adopt it.

Bishop Cooke: There are two points to which I wish to call attention at this moment. First, Mr. Simpson's amendment presupposes that whoever is elected in the General Conference shall immediately take seat in the Judicial Council. I do not think that point is well taken. He cannot take his seat until the close of that General Conference, so he will not be passing upon any act to the passage of which he is related by speech, resolution, or vote. The second point I wish to impress upon you is that all that Mr. Simpson has referred to has been provided for in this section. Suppose a delegate does take his seat in the Judicial Council and has voted in the General Conference upon constitutional questions—what happens? "No member of the Council shall hear, review, or determine any case before the Judicial Council in which he may be in any way related, nor shall he sit in the Council while such case is being examined."

Alex Simpson, Jr.: What does "related" mean there?

Bishop Cooke: Related in any way that he can be related. If I am in the General Conference and they vote on any subject, statutory or constitutional, if I am elected to the Judicial Council and that matter should be appealed to the Council, I could not sit in the Council, because I am related to that subject. I am the originator of that. I am related to it as much as I can be to any case. Certainly, I am more intimately related to it than I would be if I were of kin to a man whose case has been appealed. My relation to that subject would be closer, so that if he has voted in the General Conference, or if he has made a speech on the subject one way or the other, if he has related himself to it in any way whatever, when the Judicial Council meets "no member of the Council shall hear, review, or determine any case before the Judicial Council to which he may be in any way related, nor shall he sit in the Council while such case is being examined." So that all the provisions here are already provided for in this matter.

W. N. Ainsworth: A question for information: How many men are going to be in the Judicial Council?

Bishop Cooke: I do not think that can be determined until the number of Jurisdictional Conferences is determined.

W. N. Ainsworth: Suppose three-fourths of them have been elected to the General Conference and that during the first two or three days of the General Conference they have voted for or against a given measure that finally reaches the Judicial Council. What would you have left to consider that question?

Bishop Cooke: That would be a matter for the General Conference. The General Conference, having involved itself in that kind of a tangle, would have to untie the knot.

Bishop Denny: So long as the matter is in a man's mind and not stated in words it is, in the language of the old hero Clytus,

in a state of flux—it is flowing, it is not actually settled. But the moment any man puts in words what he has in his mind he vitalizes it and throws himself over on the side of that with which he is in coöperation. Now, if Bishop Cooke's view be the correct view, no member of the General Conference who has voted on any question before the General Conference that is brought before the Judicial Council would be eligible to election to the Judicial Council.

Bishop Cooke: There are only three.

Bishop Denny: And they have to come from Regional Conferences as well. And if that is the case, what is the objection to giving expression to that fact prohibiting the election? In addition to that, as I understand these provisions, though I have not been able to read them over with the care necessary to express a final conclusion, the Judicial Council does not sit simply during the session of the General Conference, but any action by the General Conference or Regional Conference may later on be brought before that Judicial Council for determination as to its constitutionality; and if a man had been a member of the General Conference, and if he had voted on any provision, that would render him ineligible to sit as a member of the Judicial Council. I have known this to be the case in our law courts, that a man who had been a member of a body and didn't remember whether he had voted on a matter which afterwards came before him for decision and the man said he was not eligible because he said while he didn't know whether he voted he knew how he would have voted, so I think that we should prohibit and prevent any man from being a judge of things that he has already determined by his vote.

Bishop Cooke: And that is done here.

Bishop Denny: But not so completely. This would intimate that that applies, but if this amendment is adopted we stop the possibility of anything of that kind being done and we do no harm by it; we only make provision for what is needed.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: I think history shows that one of the things that helped precipitate the troubles of France in the Revolution was a certain Act of Self-denial by which all the members of the States General cut themselves out from membership in the Constituent Assembly, and the result was that great men were absent from the leadership of France when they were wanted. The truth is, there will be very few members of the Church who would not hesitate about contemplating an election to this Judicial Council if that means they shall sever all possible connection with the General Conference and with every other matter of connectional activity of the Church for two quadrenniums. If a man were to refuse to be elected to the Regional Conference or to the General Conference in order that he might become

a member of this body, it would be affirmative evidence that he wanted to get on that Council for a purpose, and he would be more dangerous than any other man we could put there. I think we should be in no danger of finding ourselves lacking in members sufficient for this Judicial Council, but that the leading minds of the Church would be shut out.

Bishop Denny: May I ask a question for information, because I do not know?

Joseph W Van Cleve: Certainly, Bishop.

Bishop Denny: Is there anything in this provision that would prevent a man who is a member of the Judicial Council from election to the General Conference and then resigning his position on the Judicial Council.

Joseph W Van Cleve: That is not the difficulty. The difficulty is the other way around, that the man having been elected to the Regional Conference and having become a member of the General Conference thereby would not be willing to resign in order to go into this Judicial Council. The result would be that you would secure for the Judicial Council only a man who did not care to be elected to the General Conference.

Bishop Denny: Would not there be two men in each region open to election who would have sufficient ability? It seems to me you could find two.

Joseph W Van Cleve: You will find that your best men will be ineligible; and it has not been proved that a man will absolutely, when it comes to a judicial decision, stand by his action taken in some other capacity. There was a man who was Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and he as Secretary of the Treasury put to the Congress of the United States a certain financial measure. The man was afterwards elevated to the Supreme Bench, and his decision as a Justice of the Supreme Court was practically in reversal of his action as Secretary of the Treasury.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: That was Chase.

Joseph W Van Cleve: Yes. Indicating that his action at one time did not bias his judgment when it came time for him to give a judicial decision.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: That is one case out of how many million, Dr. Van Cleve?

Bishop Denny: I do not know that there is anything in this provision that would prevent such an action as this, applying it to men who have died. The Methodist Episcopal Church had a great legal mind in Bishop Morrow. We had a great legal mind in Bishop Wilson. Is there anything in this that would prevent a man who was in the episcopacy who had such legal

qualifications as those men from being elected to a position on the Judicial Council?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: This proposed amendment does not touch it at all.

Bishop Denny: I am speaking of the other matter. Brother Van Cleve said it would be difficult to find in the Church fifteen men—I don't know how it may be in our sister Church, but we have a good many more men among us who would not care for election to the General Conference who would take a position of this kind. The truth of the matter is that in many instances we do not elect our best men to the General Conference. That is true particularly of our laymen. We do not take the cream of our laymen always and put them in the General Conference.

Abram W. Harris: But you could?

Bishop Denny: Yes. Brother Reeves has been a member of the General Conference many times—

Bishop Cooke: That does not prohibit the Regional Conference from electing any man in the Jurisdiction.

Bishop Denny: What would stand in the way of a perfectly efficient Judicial Council if you should prohibit the General Conference from electing any man who is a member of the General Conference to the Judicial Council? We would not cut down the eligible people, the loyal men, qualified to pass with vigor and accuracy on the questions that were coming before them; but we would prevent a possible danger, and that possible danger is that a man would be honest and biased by the action he had taken and the votes he had cast as a member of the General Conference when he came to the Judicial Council.

Rolla V. Watt: My only interest is the welfare of the Church in getting the best men. We have gotten along in the Methodist Episcopal Church fairly well for some years with a Judicial Committee composed of members of the body, and I have never heard their integrity questioned once in all the whole period of time. I have never heard that that committee decided things on account of bias or on account of legislation in which they participated.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: It may not have come before them in that way.

Rolla V. Watt: Yes, a lot of their actions came before them.

Abram W. Harris: I wish to propose an amendment. I move that we amend Mr. Simpson's amendment by prefixing the following words: "After the first election."

The amendment was seconded.

Abram W. Harris: My reason for making that amendment is this: While I believe the amendment in principle is right and proper, it seems to me it may be difficult to organize the first Judicial Council as we would like to have it organized, if we

must exclude all the men who may be members of the General Conference and that we may faithfully make an exception as to that first Judicial Council.

A. J. Lamar: I do not know that I would be in order unless you put it on the ground of the privilege of the body—not a personal privilege, but a privilege of the body. I want to say this: We are dealing in minute particulars of organization. It is very evident to my mind—I may be mistaken—but to my mind it is very evident that if we try to work out in perfection every detail of every proposition which comes before us, we shall have to sit here three months to do it properly. What are we here for? What are we appointed for? We are appointed by our General Conferences to see if we can in a report to them suggest a basis upon which we have agreed for bringing the two Churches together. That is what we are here for. We will disagree infinitely and forever on particulars—on *minutiæ*. We have to leave something to be worked out after we are through, and what we should do here is to decide whether we can agree on the Judicial Council, and if so, to report to our Conference that we have agreed to have a Judicial Council; then give a broad outline of it or just leave it there to let the General Conference decide upon the minute details. Another question: The Status of the Negro Membership is before us and we have to report to our General Conferences on that, not for working out every small particular, but the general principles. We have agreed that in our judgment it will be best for the negro membership to be put in this relation to the Church. On this question of Conferences we have agreed, as indeed we were instructed to do, on the principle of Regional Conferences. We have further agreed that there shall be so many of these Regional Conferences and that their powers and broad outlines shall be such, not dealing in particulars, that they shall be so and so. We can come together in the course of a week, possibly on a report of that character, but we cannot get together I verily believe in a month if every minute particular is to be decided to present to the General Conference.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I think, Brother Lamar, you have already exhausted your privilege.

A. J. Lamar: I think I have, but it was worth while.

The main question was ordered.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Read the Simpson amendment.

The amendment offered by Mr. Simpson was read, as follows:

No member of the General or Regional Conferences shall, during his term of service, be eligible to election—that is the change suggested by Dr. Blake and accepted—"in the Judicial Council."

The Harris amendment is as follows:

After the first election no member of the General or Regional Conferences shall, during his term of service, be eligible to election in the Judicial Council.

David G. Downey: Would an inquiry be in order under the previous question? Does that word "election" mean that you cannot elect a member of a General Conference to membership in the future Judicial Councils beginning after that first General Conference?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I think that question will come in better when the full item comes before us.

David G. Downey: I want to get it clear in my own mind.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): How would it read if Dr. Harris's amendment is adopted?

The Secretary: His amendment to the amendment would make the amendment read:

After the first election, no member of the General or Regional Conferences shall, during his term of service, be eligible to election in the Judicial Council.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: With the consent of Bishop Denny, I will accept Dr. Harris's amendment.

Bishop Denny: I consent to that.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Then the question is on the Simpson amendment.

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to by a vote of twenty-three to twelve.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The amendment prevails and the question is now on the section as amended.

A vote being taken, the section as amended was adopted by a vote of twenty-five to nothing.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Now read that section as we have adopted it.

The section was read, as follows:

After the first election, no member of the General or Religious Conferences shall, during his term of office, be eligible to membership in the Judicial Council, nor shall he hold any other connectional office, nor serve on any connectional board of the Church during such term of service. No member of the Council shall hear, review, or determine any case before the Judicial Council to which he may be in any way related, nor shall he sit in the Council while such case is being examined.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): It should be understood that this is adopted subject to study and report by the committee, so that when we come to the final recommendation of our work we can make changes in it.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I think you will ultimately, if haply we ever get that far, have to appoint some committees to do that identical thing, to go over the whole work and make it conform.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): We have just adopted a section saying that members of the Council shall not be eligible, and then we go on and adopt another section saying that members of the General and Regional Conferences shall not be eligible, etc., so something will have to be done to rearrange those sections.

Bishop Denny: There is a resolution in the minutes somewhere that a committee shall be appointed at the close of the meetings to go over all we do and do just exactly the work here indicated. That was the motion I made at Baltimore, and I remember it distinctly.

Edgar Blake: I think it is quite probable that these reports may require some more editing. Here is a report containing eleven sections, and practically every section is being amended. It is rather difficult for some of us to carry in our minds all that has gone before, and it is quite possible that things may creep in that we do not want there in the light of all that has been done or may be done. It seems to me it would be exceedingly wise if we would instruct the Secretary after we have gotten through all these things to have the reports printed for us and distributed among us so that they can be carefully considered. I do not know whether this is the proper time to introduce such a measure, but I make that motion, that we have these reports, as adopted, printed for distribution before we adjourn.

Secretary A. W. Harris: I wish there might be included in that motion instruction to have the reports printed as we go along and then the complete reports printed also. I think all our work should be printed.

The amendment was accepted and, a vote being taken, the motion of Dr. Blake was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Now, read item six:

The members of the Judicial Council shall convene at the close of the General Conference following their election and shall organize by choosing from their number by ballot a President and a Secretary for the ensuing quadrennium. In the absence of the President at any meeting of the Council they shall elect a President *pro tem*. The Secretary shall keep a faithful record of all proceedings, records, and documents in each and every case coming before the Council, with the decision and reason for the same in every case, and shall report such decision to the parties involved and also to the succeeding General Conference.

Bishop Denny: There is some bad grammar in that. I take it for granted that the word "they" which closes the third line has for its antecedent the word "members" which is the second word of the first paragraph.

Abram W Harris: That whole sentence is absolutely unnecessary. I move to strike out that sentence which reads, "In the absence of the President at any meeting of the Council they shall elect a President *pro tem*."

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: That is an inherent right anyhow.

Rolla V Watt: It seems to me that the first line should be amended so as to provide that the members of the first Judicial Council shall convene.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): We have a motion on that now, I think.

A vote being taken, the amendment offered by Mr. Harris was agreed to and the sentence referred to was stricken out.

Abram W Harris: Now, I move to strike out in the first line the words "members of the," so that the first sentence will read: "The Judicial Council shall convene at the close of the General Conference following their election," etc.

Bishop Mouzon: I don't think that should be done. It is not the Judicial Council until the members have met and organized.

The amendment was withdrawn.

Charles A. Pollock: I call attention to a verbal matter. As the section reads the Council's meeting is at a time subsequent to the General Conference and the reference to the quadrennium is "ensuing." It is really "concurrent" and not "ensuing."

Rolla V Watt: The first Council must meet immediately after its election and perform its functions during the first General Conference. This provides that it shall be at the close of the first General Conference, and that does not apply to the first one.

Edgar Blake: That is provided for.

David G. Downey: That is provided for. Dr. Blake insisted upon its being provided for elsewhere instead of its being provided for here as it should be.

Rolla V Watt: It is not in accord with what you have done.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): There is no motion before the house.

Bishop Cooke: Mr. Maddin here has a point which I think the body ought to hear, and I would like that Mr. Maddin should explain it to you.

P. D. Maddin: My suggestion is that all decisions shall be in writing, so as to avoid mere oral decision.

Abram W Harris: Write that out.

A. J. Lamar: Does that come in Article VI. or at the end?

P. D. Maddin: It can come in Article VI., where it says that the "Secretary shall keep a faithful record of all proceedings, records, and documents in each and every case coming before the Council, with the decision and reason for the same in every case, and shall report such decision to the parties involved and

also to the succeeding General Conference." I do not think it should be left to the Secretary to give the reasons upon which the Council acted. Consequently, the Council should file a written decision in every case. The Supreme Court of the United States and the Federal Courts and most of the Supreme Courts of the States do that. It is the best way to dispose of a case by a written opinion. And it should not be left to the Secretary to write the decision, consequently I move that at the end of clause six we amend by adding the following: "All decisions of the Council shall be in writing."

The motion was seconded.

Bishop Cooke: I wanted to suggest that that could not be reached without increasing the number of lines by inserting "written" in the sentences read by Mr. Maddin.

P. D. Maddin: No, that would make the Secretary do the writing.

A vote being taken, the amendment of Mr. Maddin was agreed to.

John F. Goucher: I would like to ask for information: Is it the intention of the committee to have the election eight years after or four years after? The document reads, "The members of the Judicial Council shall convene at the close of the General Conference following their election." Now, if you go back to Section 3, it reads, "during the session of the General Conference." It strikes me there is a conflict there.

Bishop Denny: One has reference to the election and the other to the organization.

Charles A. Pollock: We did not complete the vote on the proposition of Mr. Maddin to amend that article.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): No, that vote was completed and the Chairman announced the decision that the amendment has been carried.

John F. Goucher: Article III. reads:

The ministerial and lay members from each Regional Jurisdiction shall be chosen by their respective orders during the session of the General Conference, said election being by ballot. These members shall be subject to confirmation by the General Conference.

Now Article VI. reads:

The Judicial Council shall convene at the close of the General Conference following their election and shall organize, etc.

What was the purpose of the committee in so framing that? Did they propose to have an interim of four years?

David G. Downey: I call attention of Dr. Goucher to the fact that Section 3, to which he refers, has been amended since it left the hands of the committee.

John F Goucher: I see. That accounts for the fact that No. 6 does not agree with No. 3.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): And we have no motion before us.

Abram W Harris: I move to amend so that it will read: "The members of the Judicial Council shall convene at the close of the General Conference at which they are elected."

E. B. Chappell: I second Dr. Harris's motion.

John M. Moore: I want to offer another amendment.

Abram W Harris: Here is my motion: I move to amend Section 6 in the first line, beginning after the word "convene" in the middle of the line, by substituting the words following for the words beginning "at the close of the General Conference following their election," so that it would read: "The Judicial Council shall convene at the close of the General Conference at which they are elected and shall organize," etc.

John M. Moore: Dr. Harris proposes that the members of the Judicial Council shall convene at the close of the General Conference that elected them, when some are elected at one General Conference and some at another. I move as a substitute for Dr. Harris's motion this: Strike out the words "following their election," so that it shall read: "The members of the Judicial Council shall convene at the close of the General Conference and organize by choosing from their number by ballot a President and a Secretary for the current quadrennium."

Bishop Denny: You need to repeat the auxiliary, "and *shall* organize."

Abram W. Harris: I will accept that if you will write it out.

John F Goucher: I wish to offer an amendment, to have it read: "Members of the Judicial Council shall convene at the close of each General Conference and proceed to their organization," etc.

John M. Moore: I will accept that.

John F Goucher: "Shall convene at the close of each General Conference and shall organize."

E. B. Chappell: Another matter: That word "ensuing" should be made "current."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): That was in Dr. Moore's motion.

John M. Moore: Yes, I included the word "current" instead of "ensuing."

Bishop Cooke: Why use the word "current" instead of "ensuing"?

John M. Moore: It has already begun.

Edgar Blake: I want to ask the convention, when does the current quadrennium close?

J. H. Reynolds: At the end.

John M. Moore: Then why not leave out the word "ensuing" and the word "current" too, and just say "at the close of next General Conference"?

Edgar Blake: But do we mean that?

John M. Moore: Yes.

Edgar Blake: With us the quadrennium closes at the beginning.

John M. Moore: The quadrennium cannot close until the end of the General Conference.

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: If you leave out entirely the words "for current quadrennium," do you not get the same thing, "meet and organize at the close of each General Conference and elect," etc.? That will save a whole lot of trouble.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Is there any objection to cutting those words out, "for the ensuing quadrennium"? I hear none, and those words are out.

Rolla V Watt: Still it is not clear. I want to amend by adding the words "provided, that the members of the first Judicial Council shall convene and organize as above immediately upon their election and confirmation."

Secretary A. W Harris: To what is that an amendment?

Rolla V Watt: That follows the sentence just finished. It would then read: "The members of the Judicial Council shall convene at the close of each General Conference, and shall organize by choosing from their number, by ballot, a President and Secretary; provided, that the members of the first Judicial Council shall convene and organize as above required upon their election and confirmation."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): That word "immediately" might give you trouble.

Rollo V Watt: "Immediately" means a reasonable time.

T. D. Samford: I would like to inquire of the committee the meaning of the words "a faithful record."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): We have an amendment on hand now. Brother Watt moves to insert after the sentence just approved, "provided, that the first Judicial Council shall convene and organize as above required immediately upon their election and confirmation."

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

Edgar Blake: I move the adoption of the item as a whole.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Shall we have it read as a whole?

Secretary A. W Harris: I think we can work it out. Here is the way I think it is:

The Judicial Council shall convene at the close of the General Conference following their election and shall organize by choosing from their

number by ballot a President and a Secretary; provided, that the members of the first Judicial Council shall organize immediately upon their confirmation. The Secretary shall keep a faithful record of all proceedings, records, and documents in each and every case coming before the Council, with the decision and reasons for same in every case, and shall report such decision to the parties involved and also to the succeeding General Conference. All decisions of the Council shall be in writing.

A vote being taken, the whole section was adopted.

A. W. Harris: If anyone has any stray amendments, I would like to have them written out.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Now, come to Section 7

7. *Powers.*—The Judicial Council shall have full power to review, on appeal on constitutional grounds, the acts of the General and Quadrennial Conferences, the records and documents transmitted to it from Judicial Conferences, to hear and determine questions of law and all other appeals coming to it in course of lawful procedure from Annual Conferences, from Judicial and Quadrennial Conferences (hereafter to be provided), and from the General Conference; provided, that no appeal from any Conference shall be entertained unless the same has been taken by at least one-fifth of the Conference. In all cases the decision of the Judicial Council shall be final.

Provided, that if, on a constitutional question, there shall be a majority vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Conference disapproving a decision of the Judicial Council, its construction of the question involved shall then be sent to the Annual Conferences for final approval or disapproval, as provided in Subsection 2, Sec. 2, Article VIII. of the Constitution.

Bishop Cooke: I move the adoption of the section.

The motion was seconded.

Bishop Denny: There is a question here that ought to be covered, and it is not covered in our legislation. I do not know what provision our Methodist Episcopal Church brethren have for covering it. The power of this Judicial Council goes simply to the act of the General Conference and the Regional Conferences. Who oversees the action of your different boards and what checks have you on your boards? For instance, suppose your board should undertake to pass an unconstitutional act, how do you get at that and what prevents in the meantime the institution of the act?

Rolla V. Watt: Nothing.

Bishop Denny: Ought not we to have some provision here for the Judicial Council to pass upon the constitutionality and legality of the action of a board? We have nothing in our own Church that reaches that, and I believe it to be a matter of great importance, and I think now is the time to cover it. Was it considered in the committee, Bishop Cooke?

Bishop Cooke: That particular thought was not considered except in this way: that any appeal would have to take its lawful procedure through the several courts below. This is a court of appeals.

Bishop Denny: But the original court on constitutional questions?

Bishop Cooke: The appeals are made to it after trial. Now, if there is in any board of the Church an unconstitutional act passed, the appeal would be to the Judicial Conference. It does not come immediately to this Council, but it goes to the Judicial Conference and from the Judicial Conference to this Supreme Court.

Bishop Denny: Where is the Supreme Council? This is the Judicial Council.

Bishop Cooke: I am referring to the last line on this page, and I said "Council." I should have said "Conference" to hear and determine questions of law and all other appeals coming to it in course of lawful procedure from Annual Conferences, from Judicial Conferences. Now, instead of jumping immediately from the decisions of the Chairman of the Board of Church Extension or the Chairman of the Board of Foreign Missions to the Supreme Council, it would have to come through the lower court and from there to the next and from there to the supreme, so that, I suppose, its usual course would be an appeal from the Judicial Conference, which would be composed as they always are, I suppose, and then an appeal can be taken from the Judicial Conference to the Supreme Conference—that is, the Judicial Council—but I admit that is not in the document. I suppose the Commission would have no objection to putting in something that would cover that.

Bishop Denny: Just let me make a little more specific what is in my mind, and I take a case with which I am measurably familiar. For instance, for sixteen years I was a member of our Book Committee. To our Book Committee has been committed some very considerable and some delicate powers. Suppose the Book Committee on any occasion should undertake to transcend the Constitution of the Church. We have nothing in our Discipline to check that Book Committee. Its action would go on. Suppose it took action immediately after the adjournment of the General Conference? That action would stand without the possibility of review by any person or any board in the Church for nearly four years. Great wrongs might be committed in that way. Therefore, I think that subject merits some consideration, and if it meets with the approbation of Bishop Cooke I would like that the matter should be referred to his committee for a report.

Bishop Cooke: I would like to suggest that Bishop Denny put in just what he thinks would cover that point.

Bishop Denny: Could you not cover it by saying that the Judicial Council shall have full power to review, on appeal on

constitutional grounds, the acts of the General and Regional Conferences and of the general boards of the Church?

Bishop Cooke: We can bring that in and the body can vote upon it.

C. M. Bishop: Is the effect of that to recommit that matter to the board?

Bishop Denny: I would rather do that, because Brother Thomas has something better than what I suggest.

Frank M. Thomas: I move that the clause be made to read:

It shall have power to arrest an action of a connectional board and of committees when such action is brought before it by appeal by one-fifth of the members of said board or by the College of Bishops, when the action is held by the Council to be contrary to law.

A. W. Harris: Is that a proposition to refer that with the whole article to the committee?

Bishop Denny: I think that would be wiser.

Abram W. Harris: Then, I so move.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: There are some other matters that ought to be considered. For instance, we have given these Missionary Regional Conferences, as they are called, certain legislative powers. Certainly the Judicial Council ought to have the power to review, on appeal, the constitutionality of the acts of these Missionary Regional Conferences, also the same should apply to the Annual Conferences. There are several other features that ought also to be included here. We question whether we can enumerate all these bodies that ought to be included. It seems to me that a simple statement that the Judicial Council shall have power to review, on appeal, all constitutional questions would cover the matter.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Properly brought before it.

Edgar Blake: Properly brought before it. You have already provided that the General Conference shall determine the judicial procedure, and you can leave it to the General Conference to determine how the appeals shall get before the Judicial Council. If we attempt to write into the Constitution all the details of administration, we shall cover some things and omit others. We ought to agree on some simple phrase covering the whole matter and leave the administration of the matter to be worked out by the General Conference. If we do that, I think we shall do the wise thing.

Bishop Cooke: The remark of Dr. Blake is very plausible. Our refinement—the ultrarefinement—which we have indulged in would certainly block the Constitution in such a way that it might itself have to be rewritten. I do not suppose the Commission would be at all averse to taking in that suggestion.

except that the Judicial Council shall not only pass upon the question of the Constitution, but instead of the word "constitution" we ought to use the words "all questions on appeal contrary to law." That would embrace questions of constitutional law and statutory law, so that instead of saying "Constitution" we should say "all questions or acts contrary to law," and that would cover anything and would not limit it to merely constitutional questions.

Abram W. Harris: I renew my motion to recommit the article, with all matters relating it, to the committee.

A vote being taken, the section was recommitted to the committee.

Bishop Cooke: I move that the Secretary provide these matters for the committee, because we do not know what they are.

Secretary A. W. Harris: I will delegate Brother Thomas to do that.

Bishop Cooke: We want, too, a transcript of the record, so that we can do our work properly.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): We will now take up item No. 8.

The item was read, as follows:

The Judicial Council shall prescribe rules and regulations for its government and methods of procedure for the hearing and disposition of appeals, which rules and methods shall be printed in the Discipline, and shall not be changed or altered during the quadrennium without due notice.

Bishop Cooke: I move the adoption of that section.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Bishop Cranston: Now, read Section 9.

Section 9 was read, as follows:

Two-thirds of the members of the Judicial Council shall constitute a quorum, and in no instance shall the Council hear or determine any case without such quorum.

Bishop Cooke: I move the adoption of that section.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Read paragraph No. 10.

The section referred to was read, as follows:

The Judicial Council shall meet at the same time and place as the General Conference, and shall continue in session until final adjournment of the General Conference; provided, that if during the session of a General Conference the appeal of a bishop who has been tried for any Disciplinary offense is pending, the Judicial Council shall defer its time of adjournment until it disposes of said appeal.

The Judicial Council shall convene during each quadrennium at such times and places as it may deem necessary to hear and determine appeals.

Bishop Cooke: I move the adoption of that section.

The motion was seconded.

Bishop Mouzon: I am not quite sure just what that means: "Provided, that if during the session of a General Conference the appeal of a bishop who has been tried for any Disciplinary offense is pending, the Judicial Council shall defer its time of adjournment until it disposes of said appeal."

Abram W. Harris: The court would have to try that.

Bishop Denny: Why not strike out the word "Disciplinary"?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Chair thought that Bishop Mouzon was indulging in pleasantries, from the curve of his mouth. If that was not so, it is another matter.

Bishop Mouzon: I am really in earnest. I do not know what sort of an offense might happen to turn out to be "Disciplinary."

David G. Downey: It strikes me that we ought to leave out those words, "who has been tried for any Disciplinary offense," and I move that those words be stricken out.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Query: What was carried?

David G. Downey: I think it means that the Randall amendment was carried.

Rolla V. Watt: I intended to raise a question on that quorum, but it went by so quickly that I didn't get a chance. It seems to me, in a body like this where a quorum can hear an important case, that the decision must be by at least a majority of the members of the Council. Say that there are fifteen members, a quorum would be ten, and then six of the men out of the fifteen could decide a very important constitutional question. I do not think that is right. I think it should be a majority of the total membership of the Council, and I would like to have that amended in some way. That applies to Section 9. I voted for it, and I move to reconsider the vote by which the item was adopted.

David G. Downey: I understand the purpose of the proposed reconsideration is to require a larger number than a majority of a quorum necessary to determine constitutional matters. We heard here this morning a good deal of wise argumentation as to the necessity and wisdom of a small Judicial Council. We were told that a small Council, I believe seven was indicated, would be much preferable to a larger number. Now, we are providing here for a quorum, probably not less than ten, and it will require six to decide, and if the argument for a small Judicial Council of seven had weight, these matters could be decided by four. It seems to me we are on perfectly safe ground regarding the quorum for the transaction of business. Then of course a majority of the quorum for a decision. We

must bear in mind that the quorum constructively is the entire body.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): You are speaking against the reconsideration?

David G. Downey: Yes, I am giving an argument why we should not reconsider. It is always fair to presume that a court of this character will very frequently, if not always, have more than a mere quorum, so I think we are perfectly safe to leave this as it is.

E. B. Chappell: How did we get back to No. 9? Were we not on No. 10?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): No. 10 was adopted. Now, read Section 11.

The section was read, as follows:

Vacancies shall be filled by the Council from the same order and jurisdiction in which the vacancy occurs, until the next meeting of the proper Regional or General Conference, which may then fill the vacancy for the balance of the unexpired term.

Bishop Cooke: I move the adoption of that section.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: Mr. Watt moved a reconsideration of the vote by which Section 9 was adopted.

John M. Moore: I move that we extend the time until Dr. Blake can finish.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): May I inquire of the committee whether the rules adopted at Baltimore still prevail?

John F. Goucher: We adopted new rules here.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): As to the time of meeting, but did you vacate all the others?

John F. Goucher: The precedent was established at Traverse City for our action here.

Edgar Blake: It is provided here in Section 9—

Frank M. Thomas: It is very plain that the rules adopted at Baltimore, with the exception of the time of meeting, are in force until changed. They were adopted to govern the procedure of this body.

Edgar Blake: What page is that on?

R. E. Blackwell: We decided to meet at three o'clock and adjourn at five-thirty. The first motion was that we should meet at two-thirty and adjourn at five, and then that was changed and it was made from three to five-thirty.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Chair is anxious to find whether that action was according to our rules.

Rolla V. Watt: Oh, let us get through.

Edgar Blake: The way we proceeded at Traverse City and here are two different things.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I want to be sure to be right.

Bishop McDowell: Bishop Denny is Chairman of the Committee on Procedure, and I think at Traverse City we assumed that the motion to fix the hours, whether it was formally stated or not, involved a change of the rule that had been adopted at Baltimore.

Bishop Denny: It was simply an amendment to the rules existing.

Bishop McDowell: Yesterday, when the Joint Commission fixed the hours for meeting and adjournment, whether it was formally proposed to amend or not, in substance and effect it did amend the rules that had been adopted at Baltimore.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Does the Chair then understand that all the rules adopted at Baltimore and Traverse City are vacated in the same way?

Bishop McDowell: Not until and unless vacated by a special vote. The rule for fixing the time of meetings and adjournments are fixed by the action taken yesterday. Of course it would vacate and change that rule, but in the absence of any motion to change any other rule, the other rules stand.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I do not see anything in the rules requiring that two-thirds votes make a change, and I suppose the vote yesterday was orderly and that the other rules are still in effect.

Edgar Blake: We have provided in Section 9 that two-thirds of the members of the Council shall constitute a quorum. Attention has been called to the fact that it would be possible for the Judicial Council to decide a constitutional question by a vote of six members, less than a majority of the total membership. I think it would be a rather serious matter that an important constitutional question should be decided by less than a majority of the entire Judicial Council.

E. C. Reeves: I have an amendment to offer on that. It reads:

Two-thirds of the members of the Judicial Council shall constitute a quorum, but in no instance shall the Council hear and determine any case except by a two-thirds vote of the entire membership of the body.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The motion before us is the motion to reconsider the vote by which Section 9 was adopted, and no amendments or any other motions pertaining thereto are in order until the matter of a reconsideration is passed on favorably.

A vote being taken, the motion to reconsider was carried by a vote of twenty to sixteen.

Rolla V. Watt: Now, Mr. Chairman, I move that no matter shall be determined on a vote of less than one-half of the members of the Council.

Henry Wade Rogers: Do you mean that no case shall be heard unless fifty per cent of the members are present, or that no opinion shall be rendered by less than fifty per cent of the members?

Rolla V. Watt: I don't want six men deciding very important constitutional matters.

John M. Moore: I want to say just here that the reading of Mr. Watt's amendment would lead us to infer that he had in mind questions of appeal on the trial of cases. I think in the trial of cases what we have now is sufficient, but I believe there should be a provision that in all constitutional matters a majority of the entire Council shall be necessary for a determination of a matter.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I have an amendment which is a little broader than Mr. Moore's suggestion. It changes this ninth section so that it shall read as follows: "Two-thirds of the members of the Judicial Council shall constitute a quorum, and in no instance shall a decision be rendered unless by a majority vote of the entire Council."

Rolla V. Watt: That is right.

E. C. Reeves: That is better than I had it, and that covers the case entirely.

C. M. Bishop: It occurs to me that is not altogether a wise provision. It gives too much significance to the mere absence of a member. The present rule provides that a majority of those acting in a case shall decide it: but now in case of the absence of five out of fifteen you are putting upon those who have come to give attendance to the matter too great a burden. The five who are absent are counted as voting against the others, if you proceed according to this amendment, though they have not considered the matter at all. Either you should change the number required for the quorum or let the rule stand as it is. You should either require a sufficient number of men to come, so that things can be done by a majority, or else leave it just as it is.

Rolla V. Watt: If the case is not strong enough to get eight out of fifteen, it is not very strong.

C. M. Bishop: The others have not considered it at all, and you are counting them against it. We ought to change the number required for the quorum so that a majority would be a quorum and could proceed and do business, otherwise you are absolutely prevented from doing your work, though you

have a quorum present and are able to carry a majority of that quorum in favor of the matter. But you have not done anything unless you have more than a majority of the quorum, and that gives a majority of the quorum powers which it could not have.

Henry Wade Rogers: I hope this provision will be allowed to stand as it is. I see no necessity whatever for changing it. An act of Congress or an act of a State legislature may be set aside as unconstitutional and absolutely void by the vote of five judges.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: That is a majority of the whole court.

Henry Wade Rogers: No matter, it is five. If five judges sitting as a court can set aside an act passed by the Congress of the United States, it is safe enough to trust a majority of two-thirds of the Judicial Council with determining the constitutionality of an act passed by the General Conference, and if the question is one of supreme importance to the Church you may trust the judgment of the members of your Judicial Council, if they are the proper kind of men to sit in the Judicial Council, when matters of such great importance are up. Why should we tie the hands of competent men to pass upon the case of the constitutionality of an enactment of the General Conference? It may be at times very embarrassing if you change this provision in the manner suggested by Brother Watt. Let us leave it as it is. It is safe enough.

Bishop Denny: We must keep in mind that the action of the General Conference itself is a matter of no inconsiderable moment, that if the General Conference did, by a majority vote, pass an action, it is not to be assumed that that action is unconstitutional. We have had for very many years in our Discipline a provision for checking unconstitutional actions. In its present form it came into our Discipline in 1870. Prior to that time it was in the Discipline, but it was understood by the General Conference of 1870 that it was there without the necessary legal action, so that from the beginning of our Church, the separate organization of our Church, there has been enacted a method of checking unconstitutional action. Brethren, there have been but two instances in which the College of Bishops has had to exercise the responsibility laid on it to check unconstitutional action. The General Conference is not likely to override the Constitution. If it overrides the Constitution, it is going to be from some measure of prejudice, under some excitement or under some very great ignorance. If the Judicial Council cannot secure as many as eight members, no matter how many are at the meetings to declare that action to be unconstitutional, it ought to stand. All this does is, it says before the Judicial Council can overturn any action

there must be a majority of the fifteen members present. But suppose that ten alone meet and suppose that six of them vote to declare it constitutional. That ought not to override the action of the General Conference. It ought to require eight of those ten. Dr. Bishop says that it gives too much weight to the five absent men, but it only gives weight to those five men on the assumption that they will vote against the constitutionality.

C. M. Bishop: You are assuming they will.

Bishop Denny: No, we are not assuming anything. Judge Rogers says we must assume that the Judicial Council is going to do something. Brethren, we must write in the bond what we want. We have tried the other procedure in our Church and it has led to disaster. We had assumed, and the assumption has cost us very dearly. And it seems to me when you have such an important matter as the declaration of the unconstitutionality of an act of the General Conference it ought to require eight members of those fifteen, and if only ten are present it ought to require eight of those ten. I do not see the analogy that Judge Rogers draws at all. There are nine members of the Supreme Court of the United States and it takes five members to decide.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: It takes a majority of those who sit.

Henry Wade Rogers: There is nothing in the Constitution which would prevent an act of Congress being set aside by a less number if there happened to be only seven judges sitting.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: As a matter of fact, you could never get an appellate court to render a judgment except by a majority of the entire court.

Bishop Denny: This preacher has the floor, and you two lawyers keep still. Continuing the line of my argument, if you could do it, it ought not to be possible to do it. Write it in the bond, so that it will not be possible. That is the point I am after. When a General Conference has very carefully considered a question, I think it is a very serious matter to declare the action of that General Conference unconstitutional.

John M. Moore: What is your position on the trial of cases? I am in accord with you in regard to the constitutional matter, but do you think it is necessary to have eight members decide on an appeal in the trial of a minister?

Bishop Denny: Yes, I do. Suppose a man has been adjudged guilty. As it is, the committee below by a majority vote puts a scar on that man for life, and sometimes they know they have done it by mistake or in error—I don't believe purposely, but they don't know much about the hearing of evidence. Now, when it comes before the Judicial Council I believe before there should be a reversal of that it should take eight members

of the Judicial Council. It ought to stand unless you can get that many.

R. E. Blackwell: Would your purpose be accomplished by changing the number required for a quorum? Ought we not to require enough to be there to go on and attend to business? What would you suggest as to changing the number of the quorum?

Bishop Denny: I think not. In judicial proceedings in the civil courts—although I always hesitate to compare our ecclesiastical courts to the civil courts—it takes a unanimous vote of the jury to convict any man of felony.

Rolla V. Watt: I do not like to differ with Judge Rogers and Mr. Simpson. I generally take what they think on a question of law, but I see they are divided now.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: We do not differ at all on this matter.

Rolla V. Watt: The analogy between our Supreme Court and the Supreme Court of the United States is not exactly a happy one. The Supreme Court of the United States is very much more carefully appointed by the President of the United States than is our Council appointed. The method we are bound to adopt is to allow the Regional Conferences to name the members, and we know that that appointment is not always on the basis of merit. Sometimes it will be on the basis of a little quiet politics in the different districts. It was mentioned awhile ago as to what might happen. We had a case in our Conference that came up before the Committee on Judiciary, and it was about to be reversed through the personal influence of certain men in our Conference; and I want to make that as difficult as possible, so that the hearing will be perfectly fair and safe, and I think six men in the court of our Church is too small a number to pass on these important questions.

A. J. Lamar: I move the main question.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The question is on the amendment proposed by Brother Simpson, as follows: "Two-thirds of the Judicial Council shall constitute a quorum, and in no instance shall a decision be rendered unless by the concurrence of a majority of the entire Council."

David G. Downey: Do you omit what preceded that?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): This is the amendment proposed by Brother Simpson, and the vote is first on that.

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

Edgar Blake: I want to be recorded as voting for that, because I think I shall move a reconsideration of it later on.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The vote will now be on the adoption of the section as thus amended.

A vote being taken, the motion to adopt the section was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Read the eleventh section. The eleventh section was read, as follows:

Vacancies shall be filled by the Council from the same order, lay or ministerial, and jurisdiction in which the vacancy occurs until the meeting of the Regional Conference of that jurisdiction.

Bishop Cooke: I now move the adoption of Section 11.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: There is one difficulty arising under Section 11 which arises by reason of the fact that we are now going to elect members of the Judicial Council for eight years, when they were to be elected for only four years when the report was drafted. There was no occasion to provide for filling vacancies by the General Conference, but now there is, because during eight years a member may die and there may be an intervening General Conference, and, therefore, I move to amend Section 11 so that the section shall read as follows:

Vacancies shall be filled by the Council from the same order and jurisdiction in which the vacancy occurs, until the next meeting of the proper Regional Conference, which may then fill the vacancy for the balance of the unexpired term.

The substitute was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried. A further vote being taken, the section as amended was agreed to.

Edgar Blake: Now, I desire to move a reconsideration of the vote by which Section 9 was adopted. I dislike to do it, but I think it is necessary.

Bishop Denny: I rise to a point of order. The extension of time would not embrace such a motion.

Edgar Blake: I understood it was until we concluded the report.

A. J. Lamar: Was it on motion that that was voted?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): No, I don't think so.

Edgar Blake: I can state this matter in a moment.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I think we can accommodate Dr. Blake.

Edgar Blake: It is not a matter of accommodating me. It is a matter of grave importance, as you will see when it is called to your attention. Under the amendment proposed by Mr. Simpson and adopted it requires a majority of the Council to give a decision. And we have provided, have we not, that a quorum may hear an appeal? That is ten. Now, suppose that I have been tried by my Conference for some misdemeanor and I have been judged guilty?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Properly?

Edgar Blake: No, improperly in the case I am supposing.

I have been adjudged guilty, as I think, largely through a misinterpretation and misapplication of the law. I take an appeal to the Judicial Council. Only a quorum of ten is assembled. In the prosecution of my appeal before the Council with a quorum of only ten present, I must secure a favorable vote of eight out of that ten in order to have my character set right.

David G. Downey: You had better stood by the original proposition, then.

Edgar Blake: I believe that on constitutional questions it ought to require a vote of the majority of the members of the Council, but on appeals that do not affect the Constitution, but have to do only with the application or interpretation of the law, no such burden ought to be placed on any man who wants to come before that body. A great injustice can be done one, and the matter ought to be straightened out.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: The trouble with Dr. Blake's position is, he is assuming that if ten sit and eight do not acquit him there will be a judgment of eight against him. This is not a fact. It occurs constantly in judicial tribunals that if the proper number to render a judgment from those who sit do not agree, there is a rehearing. There is certain to be that proper number before the case is decided. In the case Dr. Blake suggests, he is complaining that he has to get eight out of ten in his favor. Well, the way he wants it, six out of ten could condemn him and put him out of the running for the future; but as it is now it takes always eight men to condemn, and if eight out of ten cannot be had on that first meeting, there must be a rehearing so that the whole Council can pass upon it. Eight must be necessary to conviction.

Edgar Blake: It is not a question of my conviction. I am already convicted and put out of the ministry and I am appealing to the Council to get back.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: You are appealing to get back by a majority vote—is that it?

Edgar Blake: No, my character has been impeached unjustly and I am asking for a judgment clearing my character and only ten men meet to hear my appeal. Then I have got to get eight of those ten in order to reverse what I think is an injustice to me.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Wait a minute. You have got to have eight out of ten men sustain your conviction, and if eight of those ten men are not willing to sustain your conviction there must be a rehearing by the whole Council so that there will be a majority vote.

Edgar Blake: I don't understand it.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Under no circumstances shall a decision

be rendered against you or for you except by a majority of the entire Council.

Edgar Blake: I don't know that that is right. It means that I have got to prosecute the case until I have convinced eight out of ten men one way or the other. The point I make is this: In cases of the character that I have indicated a majority of the men who sit and hear my case ought to be sufficient to pass upon it; and for that reason I have moved a reconsideration in order that the matter may be corrected, and if we consider it I shall move to recommend the matter to the committee to correct that defect.

E. C. Reeves: If you had the entire committee, you would have to get eight.

Edgar Blake: I would, but I would have eight out of fifteen, whereas, in the other case, I have to get eight out of ten. I think any one can see that there is a difference here.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: I want to ask a question for information. Do I understand, Mr. Simpson, in the case Dr. Blake has supposed, it would be necessary for eight to decide one way or the other before the matter was settled?

Alexander Simpson, Jr.: As the court has to render an opinion, they would have to call in another Council to pass upon the matter.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: Why have that clause about the quorum, then?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: That happens in only one case out of a hundred, because such a case as Dr. Blake supposes wouldn't arise more than once in a hundred.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: But Dr. Blake in the supposed case, failing to get the eight out of the ten, would still stand impeached?

Edgar Blake: Not only that, but I have no relief except to prosecute my appeal a second or third or fourth time until I can convince eight out of ten members of the court who hear the appeal.

M. L. Walton: I think the flaw in what Mr. Simpson says is this: That there is nothing in this that compels the matter to come up *de novo* before the full court. Suppose this smaller number does not agree in the matter. How will the matter come up before the full court?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: It comes up *ipso facto*.

M. L. Walton: Not if they vote as indicated. They vote according to their individual views, and if a majority vote in that way, how are you going to get a rehearing of that case?

Bishop McDowell: I have not taken any part in the discussion this afternoon, but may I endeavor to put this case now as I think some would like to have it put? Let me assume that

a minister has been tried and convicted and suspended from all ministerial and other privileges. He takes an appeal to the Judicial Council. Let us suppose, now, that only ten members out of the Judicial Council appear when his case comes up for hearing. That would constitute a quorum under the rule. But, let us suppose when the case comes before this Judicial Council involving his ministerial standing, involving the life of himself and his family, that seven out of ten are of the opinion that the unfavorable decision rendered against him should be reversed. Under that state of the case, as I understand the interpretation made by Mr. Simpson, the vote of the seven does not constitute a decision at all. Is that right?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Perfectly.

Bishop McDowell: Now, the Judicial Council adjourns leaving this minister still in a state of suspension with no opportunity to perform his ministerial functions and with no opportunity to earn his living in his original profession, no opportunity to provide for his family by the usual method. Suppose this Judicial Council does not meet again for another year. He is still suspended until it gets together again. Suppose it gets together again, and again only ten members appear and again seven vote for a reversal of that first decision, how long can that continue? Apparently a man can be suspended and carry his appeal to the Judicial Council and not get it decided for two or three or possibly four years. But, Mr. Chairman, all our procedure assumes that in cases of suspension the Annual Conference next succeeding terminates the period for which the suspension is made. I voted a moment ago for Mr. Simpson's amendment, but I am frank to say I did it without seeing the effect. But the appeal that Dr. Blake has made has profoundly moved me, and I can see that in the case he puts the life of many ministers may be involved, and I believe that a personal matter should stand on a different basis from a legal matter involving a constitutional question. I think, therefore, that the determination of a constitutional matter should require a majority of the entire Council, but that for the determination of a personal matter a proper majority of the required quorum should be sufficient to make the decision.

Bishop Denny: We are dealing with one of the most delicate matters that we can possibly be called on to deal with, and I do not see how we are to settle it except on the balance of possibilities. Where a Methodist preacher is tried, while, to be sure, on the basis of the State it is only a question of the membership in the organization, at the same time if you draw the analogy between that and the man who is tried in a criminal court, it is a question practically of his life in every instance. But now, the argument made by Dr. Blake and by Bishop McDowell is, it

seems to me, proceeding upon the wrong point and is overlooking certain facts. There has been a trial, and in that trial the member has, by a majority vote, I do not now recall what your Discipline says, but in our Discipline it must be of thirteen or maybe as low as nine, ordinarily I think it is a committee of thirteen, and seven of those must be convinced that the man who comes before them is guilty. If seven of them say they are not convinced that he is guilty, he goes free, and there is no appeal by the Church. That finally frees them, that lets him go forever on that charge; but, suppose seven members say that a man is guilty as charged in that bill of particulars? Something very serious stands against that brother. It is not a small matter to have a majority of the committee say that a man has been guilty of some charge that would put him out of the laws of society or put a scar on him for the rest of his life. Now, he comes before the committee on appeal, and under the constitution that has prevailed in Methodism since 1808 he comes in already a convicted man. He is given another opportunity, and this amendment says that unless eight out of ten find him guilty he still has another chance. But, if eight decide in his favor, he goes free. If he is able to win eight out of the ten, he goes free. Less than eight cannot pass finally on that burden. He still has another opportunity. Here is a question of time, to be sure, in our Church, and I suppose it is the same also in your Church: the decision of a committee is the decision of the Conference. We generally try only by committees. A matter rarely goes before the entire Conference. I have never known it to go before the entire Conference unless the Conference was very small, and then it goes before a Committee on Appeals which consists of seven, I believe, with a bishop who presides, but who cannot vote. He presides simply as moderator of the body. That committee gives a man a hearing, but it may take a year—I have known cases to occur in our own Church where two years elapsed before a man got a hearing by the Committee on Appeals, but he has had his hearing before the committee of his brethren, and all the Committee on Appeals can do is to take the written record and decide upon it. I suppose that is also the case with you. This provision seems to me to be a provision for protection as it ought to be and not an affliction. So I am in favor of the proposition as it originally stood.

John M. Moore: Suppose three men out of the ten would say this man is not guilty? Then, can he get a decision there?

Bishop Denny: It is no decision.

John M. Moore: Then he goes free?

Bishop Denny: No, the case has to come up before another meeting. If three out of the ten say the case ought to be reversed, the other seven could not say the decision should stand,

and you would have to bring in some other man until they got eight one way or the other.

Rolla V. Watt: I am sorry to take another minute of time, but I am glad that Bishop Denny has brought up the point that the man has had his opportunity. I am not a minister, but I have attended Conferences about as regularly as any minister for the last thirty years. I have watched procedure, and my experience is that ministers down in their hearts don't want anybody to be convicted unless the guilt is clear. Ten have been let out where one has been convicted. Some have been let out who never should have been let out. I don't exactly understand about these various appeals. He is tried and then he appeals—

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): He appeals to the Judicial Conference.

Rolla V. Watt: And then he appeals to the court of last resort, it goes before the Judicial Council.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): On a question of law, I don't think any good honest man will ever have any trouble of that character.

Edgar Blake: But I know of a case where if the bishop in a trial had ruled in a certain way—and he was inclined to rule that way until he took counsel with another bishop—he would have caused the impeachment of a preacher's character from which there could never have been an escape. Under our present system there is no appeal from a ruling of the bishop except to the General Conference. That is a matter of law between him and the bishop, but under this proposed system it seems that a way will be opened.

Rolla V. Watt: Do you think the safety of the whole system should be overthrown on account of a very exceptional case?

Edgar Blake: No, but I am asking that he shall have a fair chance in the Judicial Council. I am asking that he shall be required to win only a favorable judgment of a majority of the men who hear his case, and you are asking that he shall secure the favorable judgment of four-fifths of the men.

Rolla V. Watt: Provided only ten sit.

E. C. Reeves: The Church is a prosecutor and you have to reverse the findings.

Edgar Blake: Unless that man secures eight out of ten he stands in the relation of an impeached man.

Rolla V. Watt: Until he gets another hearing.

Edgar Blake: And he may be a man who has not money enough to prosecute appeals indefinitely. You are putting an undue burden upon him. I move a reconsideration of the vote by which this article was adopted.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: I want to call attention now to one thing that many of the brethren seem to have overlooked. There has

been a constant reference to the fact that when the court fails to get a majority decision you call in the other members of the court. The analogy of the civil courts with this Judicial Council lacks this one thing: That there is not the incentive to secure an attendance of the Judicial Council that there is in the case of civil courts. I think, in view of that, there should be latitude allowed the man who takes an appeal.

A vote being taken, the reconsideration was ordered by a vote of twenty to thirteen.

Edgar Blake: Now, I desire that the section be recommitted to the committee for a rewriting.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

John M. Moore: I have here copies of the report on the Status of the Negro in the Reorganized Church. If it is the will of the body, I can submit this report without reading. What is the will of the body?

The report was submitted without being read. (See report on page 100.)

Various announcements were made and the session adjourned with benediction by the Chairman, Bishop Earl Cranston.

THIRD DAY, FRIDAY, JANUARY 25, 1918.

MORNING SESSION.

The Joint Commission was called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Earl Cranston.

The hymn, "Come, thou Fount of every blessing," was sung.

Dr. David G. Downey conducted the devotional exercises and read the second chapter of 1 Corinthians. Dr. Downey also led in prayer.

Two verses of the hymn, "Nearer, my God, to thee," were sung, after which there was prayer by Rev. Frank M. Thomas.

The journal of yesterday's session was read and approved.

Bishop Collins Denny took the chair as presiding officer.

The roll call was had, and the following were present: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke, Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. B. Murrah, W. A. Candler, James Atkins. Ministers: Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. W. Van Cleve, J. J. Wallace, C. M. Stuart, Frank M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar. Laymen: G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, H. W. Rogers, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock, M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves.

Secretary Frank M. Thomas: I wish to make a statement. I received a letter from Dr. Cannon, of the Virginia Conference, transmitting a copy of a resolution passed by the Virginia Annual Conference a year ago and laid before us at our Baltimore meeting, asking that the sessions of this body be open. The body did not change its ruling at Baltimore, but Dr. Cannon insists that I lay this resolution before the body, and I do so. While I am on my feet, I would like to say that the Committee on Inaccuracies in Proceedings has still to hear from the brethren in regard to errors. We have had private conferences, but no authentic statement of errors.

Edwin M. Randall: Have copies been supplied to all the brethren so that they may examine the report?

Secretary Frank M. Thomas: They have, with one or two exceptions, and we expect to get two or three copies in to-day.

Edwin M. Randall: I have not received my copy. The mails were very slow, and I was obliged to leave some time in advance of my copy getting there.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The order of the day was the consideration of the report, without recommendations, of the Committee on the Status of the Negro in the Reorganized Church. It will be presented by Dr. Moore and the Secretary.

John M. Moore: As these reports are now in our hands they have the word "sub" in them in several places. The Committee desires to change the word "Sub" to "Associate," and in reading the report that word should be changed to "Associate."

The report referred was as follows:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF THE NEGRO IN THE REORGANIZED CHURCH.

The Committee on the Negro met at the close of the meeting of the Joint Commission in Traverse City, Mich., July 3, 1917, and appointed a subcommittee of two members from each Commission. The subcommittee made the following preferential and alternative reports. The committee herewith presents these two reports as submitted to it to the Joint Commission, without recommendation.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE.

Your committee have found it impossible to present their conclusions as to what should be the status of the negro membership in the reorganized and unified Church without stating the same in form which relates this subject to questions already reported upon or to be reported upon by coördinate committees and tentatively adopted by the Joint Commission. We present as our preferential report the following, which places the negro membership in a Sub-Regional Jurisdiction of the kind and powers herein indicated:

Associate Regional Conferences.

Section 1. There shall be the following Associate Regional Jurisdictions, each having its own Associate Regional Conference:

(1) The Afro-American, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction

all Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions composed of persons of African descent in the United States and in the Continent of Africa.

(2) The Latin-American, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in Latin-American countries, including Porto Rico, Cuba, Mexico, Central America, and South America.

(3) The European, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in the countries of Europe, Northern Africa, and the Madeira Islands.

(4) The Eastern Asiatic, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in China, Korea, Philippine Islands, and Malaysia.

(5) The Southern Asiatic, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in India and Burma.

Sec. 2. *Members.*—Each Associate Regional Conference shall be composed as follows:

One ministerial and one lay delegate elected by each Annual Conference of its jurisdiction for each 5,000 Church members in full connection or fraction of two-thirds thereof, and one ministerial and one lay delegate elected by each Mission Conference of its jurisdiction.

Ministerial delegates shall be elected by the ministerial members of the Annual or Mission Conference, and the lay delegates shall be elected by the lay members of the Annual or Mission Conference.

Ministerial and lay delegates shall possess the same qualifications as are required in the case of ministerial and lay delegates respectively to a Regional Conference.

An Annual Conference within an Associate Regional Jurisdiction may elect reserve ministerial and lay delegates not exceeding three each and not exceeding the number of its delegates.

Each Annual Conference within an Associate Regional Jurisdiction shall be entitled to at least one ministerial and one lay delegate in the Associate Regional Conference.

Each Associate Regional Conference shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members.

Sec. 3. *Meetings.*—Each Associate Regional Conference shall meet not more than six nor less than three months in advance of the regular meeting of the General Conference, at such time as may be determined, and at such other times and places as it may itself determine. Special meetings of any Associate Regional Conference shall be convened by the bishops of its jurisdiction whenever a majority of the Annual Conferences of the jurisdiction shall request such special session.

Sec. 4. *Powers.*—(1) Each Associate Regional Conference shall have, subject to the restrictions and limitations of this Constitution, authority to legislate over all distinctively Associate Regional affairs of the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions embraced within its area, but shall not make any rule or regulation contrary to or in conflict with any rule or regulation made by the General Conference for the government and control of the connectional affairs of the Church.

(2) Each Associate Regional Jurisdiction shall be entitled to be represented in the General Conference by five ministerial and five lay delegates, who shall be elected by its Associate Regional Conference at the regular meeting preceding the meeting of the General Conference. The ministerial delegates shall be chosen by the ministerial members and the lay delegates by the lay members of the Associate Regional Conference by ballot. Said ministerial delegates shall be at least twenty-five years of age and shall have been members of an Annual Conference for at least four years, and at the time of their election and at the time of the session

of the General Conference shall be members of an Annual Conference within the jurisdiction or area of such Associate Regional Conference by which they are elected.

Lay delegates shall be at least twenty-five years of age and shall have been members of the Methodist Church for at least four years, and at the time of their election and at the time of the session of the General Conference shall be members of a pastoral charge within the bounds of the Associate Regional Conference by which they are elected.

The right to vote in an Associate Regional Conference for either ministerial or lay delegates to the General Conferences shall be restricted to the ministerial and lay delegates representing an Annual Conference.

(3) The effective bishops resident within an Associate Regional Jurisdiction shall preside over the session of the Associate Regional Conference thereof, as said bishops may themselves determine, but if there shall be no bishop resident in the jurisdiction of said Conference at the time of its session, the general superintendents shall designate one of their number for such presidency.

(4) (We recommend the amendment of the plan, already tentatively agreed upon, so as to include under the powers of the General Conference the following:

"To fix, according to the needs of each Associate Regional Jurisdiction, the number of bishops to be elected by the Associate Regional Conference thereof, provided that an Associate Regional Jurisdiction having less than 100,000 Church members shall not have power to elect bishops, but the General Conference shall have power to elect and assign bishops for residential supervision to such jurisdiction.")

(5) The Associate Regional Conference of the Associate Regional Jurisdiction having 100,000 Church members in its jurisdiction shall have power to elect from time to time the number of bishops determined by the General Conference according to the needs of such jurisdiction. Said bishops, when their election is confirmed by a majority vote of the General Conference, shall be consecrated by the general superintendents.

(6) Any Associate Regional Conference may make recommendations concerning changes in the boundaries of the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions within its area to the General Conference which is vested with full power to determine the same.

(7) The Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions of an Associate Regional Jurisdiction shall not vote on constitutional changes.

ALTERNATIVE REPORT.

We present as an alternative report the following, which places the negro in an Associate General Conference:

1. Create an Associate General Conference which shall comprise within its jurisdiction the negro membership of the Church in the United States and Africa, and which shall have complete legislative, judicial, and executive powers in the ecclesiastical government of said negro membership in harmony with and subject to the Constitution of the unified Church. Said Associate General Conference shall have the power to elect the bishops, constitute the boards, and elect their general administrative officers, for the said negro Conferences and membership.

2. Create a Judicial Council for and out of the said negro membership, whose duties and prerogatives shall be the same or similar to those of the other membership and jurisdiction of the unified Church, represented by the General Conference.

3. Create a Constitutional Council, to which shall be referred all and only questions as relate to and affect the Constitution of the unified Church and which demand consideration and determination. Said Constitutional Council shall be constituted of representatives of each of the

jurisdictions in proportion to the Church membership represented by the respective General Conferences.

4. Provide for the representation of each jurisdiction in the connectional administrative boards in proportion to the Church membership and interests involved.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The report is in the hands of the Joint Commission.

Henry Wade Rogers: I move that it be now considered paragraph by paragraph.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Is the motion seconded?

There was no second.

John M. Moore: I did not rise to second it. I do not think it is the proper action to take.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): There will be no discussion of that motion until there is a second.

J. H. Reynolds: I second the motion.

John M. Moore: I do not think that is the line of procedure we should take. We are dealing with an element of our membership under the report of this committee, and not with really what I would call a scheme—taking this from the word *skema*—of our economy. What we are trying to do is to find a place for the negro in the economy we have produced or are in the act of producing; and it seems to me this matter of Conferences should be brought to us by the Committee on Conferences, and not by the Committee on the Status of the Negro. Take the alternative report. It does not work out a perfect scheme of Associate General Conferences. It simply presents in outline certain features of the Associate General Conferences, indicating powers that should be delegated to the Associate General Conferences in order to give the negro his place in the Church where he may come to a proper self-consciousness and self-assertion in the determination of the affairs of his own religious life. It seems to me that this report made by the subcommittee brings to us two ideas, the idea of putting the negro membership into an Associate Regional Conference or of putting him into an Associate General Conference. It is not a question of this machinery or scheme that we are concerned about. The theory again is this: Here are two ideas: shall we put the negro into an Associate Regional or shall we put him into an Associate General or shall we combine the two in some way and shall we substitute something for either or both of these? That is the question before us—not simply this outlined plan that we have here—and I think the motion made by Judge Rogers is not the one we should have before us, but that we should take up the discussion of these two ideas and spend some time in their consideration, and after that has been determined we can work out the plan of the execution of it. If we adopt the idea that the negro element is to be put

into an Associate Regional Conference, we can perfect that scheme. If we decide the other way, we must perfect the scheme of the Associate General Conference in order to give right powers and opportunity for our negro membership. It seems to me this is the proper course, and it is to my regret that I must oppose the motion of Judge Rogers.

Henry Wade Rogers: I made the motion because the report is designated "Preferential Report" as it came from the committee, and if it is a preferential report I see no reason why we should not pursue the same course with reference to its consideration that we have pursued in considering the other reports that have been presented to the Joint Commission. However, I am not urgent on the matter. I am perfectly willing that the matter should come up in the manner suggested by Dr. Moore. Perhaps it may save time to have it come up first in that form, and I am willing to withdraw my motion.

John M. Moore: Will you join me in a motion that we discuss the two ideas?

Henry Wade Rogers: Certainly. Willing, perfectly willing.

John M. Moore: I move that we discuss the matter of Associate Regional and Associate General Conferences.

The motion was seconded by Judge Rogers.

Bishop Leete: Do I understand that we are confined to the use of the word "Associate," or is the whole proposition before us? and can we discuss it more widely than those phases indicate?

John M. Moore: To be sure. We have brought in two ideas; but if there is a third better or a terminology that is better, we are open to suggestions. The committee has brought this to you without recommendation in order that the Commission may make suggestions, and we shall be glad to have any brother suggest a different thought, and then if it is your will it can be recommitted to the committee again.

Bishop Leete: I want the thought made clear that we are at liberty to discuss anything pertinent to this matter, that the matter is before us in a broad way, and that we are free to offer suggestions.

Bishop Cranston: I am glad that Dr. Moore, as a member of the committee, proposes to guide the discussion in the way he has indicated. It would be very unfortunate if any of the incidental phraseology in which the report is presented should obscure the merit of the two propositions involved. The committee found it necessary, as stated in the outset, to present its conclusions in terms with which the Joint Commission had become familiar, and so took up that which appeared to be the most acceptable form of government and couched their recommendations in that frame. Now that couch and that frame do not

come together very rhetorically. I am not thinking very rapidly this morning, but I think you understand what I mean. There are those who object to the term "Sub-Regional." The committee, of course, is not standing for that nor against it. The language used by the committee in the report is simply an attempt to present the thought in convenient and intelligible manner so far as we could interpret the conditions at the time the report was framed.

George Warren Brown: I would like to see the reports of the subcommittee discussed as such rather than go into the entire field of various schemes that might be brought out, because we have appointed this subcommittee for the purpose; and if we do not concentrate this hour on discussing this preferential report and this alternative report we had as well not have appointed the subcommittee. I think we should make better headway to see how we can relate our thoughts to this preferential and this alternative report.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Dr. Moore's motion is before you. Are you ready for the question?

The question was called for and, a vote being taken, the motion of Rev. John M. Moore, second by Judge Henry Wade Rogers, was carried.

E. C. Reeves: I thought we would be heard before you took that vote. I wanted to make a remark or two.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Without objection from any one, Judge Reeves will be allowed to make his remarks.

E. C. Reeves: I do not believe in nibbling at this question. As I understand the motion, we are going to determine whether or not the negro is going to be a part of the General Conference of the unified Church or whether he is to occupy some other relation to it; but the straight question with some of us and with our General Conference is whether he is to be a member of the Church at all. Why not determine that? These other matters can be settled when that is settled. Until that is settled we cannot settle anything else. We are playing Hamlet with Hamlet left out.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The motion of Dr. Moore threw the whole question open to be discussed in all its breadth, and it is not confined to either of these reports or to both of them. The whole question is thrown open.

E. C. Reeves: Then, why haven't we Dr. Goucher's paper and why haven't we your report as part of that committee? Why have we not had all those papers read before this body, so that we can discuss them and go into the whole question? Then, when we get each other's minds, we shall know how to act in the premises. If we take up a little piece here and a little piece there, we won't get through by next spring. I want the whole

question up; and I am probably not talking out of meeting when I say that in a kind of caucus we held last night it was agreed that before we vote on any question each body should have the right to retire and consult, your Commission and our Commission, or any five on our part can call for such a meeting as that. Now, let us get the matter up and talk the whole thing over.

Bishop McDowell: Before we do anything else, let me tell Judge Reeves that we have just about the same provision.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): What was that, Bishop McDowell? Did I understand that you wanted all the reports?

Bishop McDowell: No, just a little quiet conversation with Judge Reeves to tell him that we are all in the same case regarding the caucus.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The Chair is in an expectant attitude and ready to recognize any member who claims the floor.

E. C. Reeves: What is the matter before us?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The motion of Dr. Moore that the two reports presented and the whole question should be up for discussion. If you will permit the Chair to draw an analogy, when the Constitution of 1777 came before the Virginia Constitutional Convention, everything in it was discussed at the pleasure of any of the members, particularly one Patrick Henry. Now, we are, under Dr. Moore's motion, ready for such a discussion.

E. C. Reeves: Just a question of inquiry: Have you the report you made at Traverse City—is that before us?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The whole question is before you.

E. C. Reeves: That particular paper—I don't see it here and I didn't hear it read. How is it before us?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Everything pertaining to this subject is before us, and I recognize Dr. Moore.

John M. Moore: We have spent thirteen days together, and the progress which we have made in the work for which we were commissioned has, to my minds, been truly remarkable. I had not supposed that we could make such progress in thirteen days as we have made, looking at it from the beginning. I believe that it is a feeling with us all, amounting almost to a conviction, that if we can come to a satisfactory agreement on the status of the negro in the unified Church, we can, without question, consummate a plan upon which we can agree. I know that there are some objections to the Regional Conference system. To my mind that is the greatest thought in all the polity that we have been trying to agree on. I believe that the Regional Conference system is absolutely essential to the proper administration of a great Church, embracing this entire country and foreign fields, that would contain a membership of something like six millions.

I believe that the judicial system that we have wrought out will prove satisfactory. I am inclined to think that the whole scheme of government upon which we have tentatively agreed, or upon which we have reports ready to be made, will furnish to us a plan for the great Church. The membership of our two great Churches is turning to us to-day with an interest that it has not had before. There is a feeling on the part of all that if these negotiations are blocked at all, they will be blocked by lack of agreement on the status of the negro in the unified Church. This is my solemn conviction. I have had a number of letters since I have come here and I have seen a great many people during the last three or four months, and there has been just the one question in their minds, "Do you think you can come together on the negro question?" So I think we have come face to face with the important issue of this great meeting. Some men said at Baltimore: "What is the use of our going on with this matter of Regional Conferences or the General Conference or the Judicial Council if you cannot agree upon the negro question? Why not take that up first?" You could not take that up first. You have to build your house before you can assign rooms to occupants. We had to build the scheme of our government before we could determine what there was into which we should fit the various elements of our membership. So we have come to this question as early as possible. The time has come when we must look each other fairly in the face and give honest and free and sober consideration to the question that is before us. For one, I am not willing that any agreement shall be made that shall not be in the highest degree absolutely fair to the negro membership as well as to the white membership, whether North or South. I do not think we want to hurt anybody. I think we want to make a system that will be for the development of Methodism among the colored people of this country and of the other countries of the world. I do not believe we should build a system that will not put such restrictions upon the negro membership that they cannot feel that freedom of action that is necessary to enable them to come to their highest development. It has been a great desire of mine that the system we create shall really bring about the unification of the Methodisms of this country. I think the time has come when we should not have seventeen varieties of Methodists in America. There is not only a need that we should eradicate this friction that exists between the white membership of the North and the white membership of the South, but the time has come when we must remove the difficulties and friction that exist between the four branches of the negro Methodists of this country. We are not here, however, to legislate regarding three of the great branches of negro Methodism. I realize that. We have not been asked to do it.

We have simply to deal with this one element; but while we are dealing with that element we must think also of allaying the difficulties among the other people. It seems to me that we have had brought before us two plans that may be seriously considered. I know the action that was taken by my General Conference. There was a suggestion there that has been interpreted by some to mean an absolutely independent Church. I think the great majority of our people would favor above everything else an independent Church for the negro element of this Church, and also that would combine within its fold all the negro Methodist bodies of this country. Personally, I say frankly that it has also been my conviction that that is the best thing for the negro. I have said as much to Dr. Jones and to Dr. Penn, and to some others of our Northern brethren. But I have realized that an independent Church for this element could not be agreed upon by you. Then the question is, What is the next best thing to do—how can we meet the demands of our people that there be an independent organization—that is, a separate organization, an organization where the negro shall be almost, if not altogether, autonomous and yet have such fraternal relations as shall be more than simply an expressional relation—a real, actual, vital relation? How can we do that? That is the question before us, presented to us in these two plans that your committee has presented. One plan is the Associate Regional system, sometimes called the Sub-Regional, sometimes the Missionary; but it is the same thing, whatever the terminology. It provides a restricted relationship of the negro element and other mission elements to the great work of the Church, giving them a restricted power in the Church because of the fact that they are in a more or less sense to be dependent upon the benefactions of the white American Church for the ongoing of the work committed to them. That presents the one thought, and we should explore fully what is meant by this Associate Regional Conference. We know that they are to have limited representation in the General Conference. This plan proposed gives them only ten representatives. They have no vote on constitutional changes. There is nothing said of their membership on the general boards. In other words, they are given a very limited voice in the general affairs of the Church. This Associate General Conference proposes that they shall have a very large control of the interests of their membership. It provides that they shall have a Judicial Council of their own for the determination of cases on appeal. It provides that they shall have membership on the Constitutional Council, which is a body not spoken of hitherto. That is a body which shall have direct control of the questions that affect the Constitution as they may arise at the General Conference, or otherwise as this Commission may determine. It pro-

vides that they shall have membership on the general boards in proportion to the membership and interests which they have. Exactly the amount of interests they may have is something we must determine, but it is not a matter that will give us any great trouble. These are the two ideas before us. I want to say this morning, brethren, that the questions about which I am concerned are: What will be the best thing for the negro Methodists? and what will be for the best interests of the white Methodists? and what will be for the best interests of the reunited Methodists of this country? You cannot make unity in a family by merely uniting a man and woman in the bonds of matrimony. You can have unity and harmony only when you have the spirit of love. We cannot bring elements together that will actually be destructive and hurtful to each other. We must bring these elements together in such a way that there shall be perfect harmony and a working together, the one with the other. This morning I want to say, as a Southern man, God helping me, I will do more for the negro man in the South and in this country in the future than I have ever done in the past. It is my firm conviction to-day that the people of my section and my Church have never had as keen a desire to serve the colored people of the South as they have to-day, and there has never been a time when our people were more favorably inclined and more desirous of helping these who are our associates, our fellow laborers, in the development of their religious life than this moment. As we come here to-day I trust we are not coming together to sit at a table and see who can get the better of the other. No, we are members of one great family, met for the purpose of determining what is the best thing to do for those who look to us for leadership and help. God helping us, we are not diplomats, but brothers trying to find the way under Divine leadership to bring about a plan that will be satisfactory to all.

Bishop Hamilton: Mr. Chairman and Brothers, Judge Reeves knows that I appreciate fully his frankness and his openness and even his square differences of opinion in his speech. I believe you will allow us, representing the Methodist Episcopal Church, to speak just as frankly and as openly and as lovingly as any of your brethren from the South. I have tried from the beginning to get myself into a line of thought that would think with you and for you. I have felt that it was difficult for you brethren in anything that has been said here to think with us and for us. You must appreciate that in any claim for changes to be made with regard to the negro, you are asking changes of us, changes of things that are fifty years old, changes that involve a sentiment, a principle, as we believe, rooted and grounded in the New Testament and in the fact of regeneration. We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren,

and the change you are asking from us the parties interested themselves do not want—have said so time and again and are saying so in this meeting. It would seem that we ought to have some defense for claiming that these brethren who are the parties most in interest should be heard, should have some consideration, some brotherly kindness born from above. We have a difference of viewpoints from which to discuss this whole question. Your viewpoint is the one that obtained in our Northern section when slavery prevailed there. There is not a difference of opinion—there is not a matter of persecution that has been witnessed in the South that cannot be duplicated in the North if you will go back far enough. That sentiment has changed so absolutely in all our section that we have come to a control, in national legislation, which is both organic and statutory, and is to-day, if majorities are to determine, the spirit of the age. Now, if you will permit me to diverge a little with the intention of focusing what I say on the question that is specifically before us, I would like to say that we view this whole matter from two standpoints: First, that which is missionary; second, that which is without discrimination, spiritual or ecclesiastical. From the missionary viewpoint, we have precisely the same difficulties as the South that we meet in discussing this question here and now. As a preliminary to anything I shall say, first of all I want it understood that there is no man on this floor who is more committed to unification than I am; and I have made a proposition that is so different and distinct from any that has been made here before that it goes farther, not in magnanimity but in Christian brotherhood: a plan of bringing all the brethren upon an equal footing in every respect, so far as organization is concerned, into relation with us. Let me look at this missionary viewpoint for a moment. I have had my home for forty years in a city of between seven and eight hundred thousand population. Of that population, less than two hundred thousand are native sons and daughters of what Emerson was wont to call “that darling town of ours.” We have there almost every language that is spoken in this country. We have Greeks and Italians in very large numbers. I do not care for what I am to say to be published outside of this meeting, but the largest denomination in this country next to our own is represented in our city by two of our largest congregations. The pastor of this largest congregation waited upon me and said: “Bishop, it is a shame that we are doing nothing in this city for Christian missions.” I said; “My brother, we are not doing anything like what we ought to do.” He said: “There is nothing being done for the Italians.” I said: “My brother, we have a Church of five hundred members.” “You have?” said he; “I never heard of it.” Then I said: “We have in this city a mission whose annual budget is \$60,000, the like

of which is not to be found anywhere on this continent, and it is so exemplary that they are coming from distant cities to see what we have." "You amaze me," he said. We have differences not only with other denominations in this direction, but among ourselves. I know of a gentleman in Boston who carries a title to his name which would put him high in the ranks, a man beyond seventy years of age, who left his own communion within the last three years and joined another Church, because, as he said, "They have got to bringing servant girls into our Church, and I cannot stand it." We have already had printed in one of our papers within the last few weeks a statement representing one of the largest judicial territories, as well as one in official situation most prominent, a brother who has said, "I feel that in this matter of Church relationship I want just the same selective privilege that I have in society and in business as to whom I shall worship with, when and where." If that is to be the policy of the Methodist Episcopal Church because she has come to have great numbers and great wealth, where then, please, are all our missions to go, not only among the colored people, but in foreign countries? Where are we to place our teachers who have been doing this so-called humiliating work? Where is Miss Reed to be reckoned among the lepers? Where is such estimate to drive our Lord, who ate and drank with publicans and sinners and had harlots gather to him as their only refuge? Brethren, we do not believe when we have friends to whom our Lord sticketh closer than a brother that they are to be kept in any kind of sub-relation to ourselves. When a man is born from above and is brought into proper relations by tuition in our Church, we think that under God and with the Lord Jesus Christ there is nothing else to do but to give him all the rights we have. I have just a little bit of personal experience, if you will allow me. I was on the first Committee of Five that built the first tabernacle for Mr. Moody when he came into the city of Boston. Before and all through the time of the Moody meetings there was not a church in Boston that was not a pewed church, our churches included. I knew a church in Boston, increased in land value by increment to \$300,000, to build an edifice in that Back Bay and crown it with golden images of holy angels and sell its pews like you would sell a piece of real estate or personal property at auction for respectively \$6,000, \$5,000, and down to \$500. I saw that church a few years later foreclosed under a mortgage for \$65,000 and go into the hands of an entirely different denomination because the same rich men who built it would not pay the interest on their mortgage. I was appointed in the city of Boston by Bishop Simpson and others because I advocated no doors on pews, an open and free gospel to the city of Boston without shelter over my head and without a church in which to

worship. Of course I went to the appointment, and I stayed right in the center of a district where one of the churches of our denomination had literally been plucked up by the roots. I had \$5,000 in the bank that I had saved from having different pastorates of \$2,000, \$3,000, and \$5,000 each. The first year I received \$183, the next \$300, and I never received over \$1,250, and I gave back \$250 of that to the Church. I am not boasting, God knows, for it cost me my family. We had to keep boarders in the city of Boston to pay our way. My own Conference passed a resolution against the undertaking, and the bishop at one time called me before a Committee of Laymen and Preachers hoping to have me abandon the whole enterprise. But in that meeting one of the laymen arose and said, "Has Dr. Hamilton called upon you to ask for this meeting—has he had anything to say about this matter?" Nothing whatever. That inquiry ended the meeting. My successors in that church that was built there received from \$4,000, \$5,000, to \$6,000 in that pulpit. I made no discrimination as to class or race. I had on my official board a colored man occupying a high position in one of our banks who was an ordained deacon. Every time I administered the communion he assisted, and the Democrats as well as Republicans, without any thought of discrimination, bowed around the altar. While I was pastor of that Church I had one of your daughters of the South, a member of one of your old families, who had been converted to God and who wanted to start a little Sunday school class, and she was advised to start it in connection with a white Church. They told her they had no class for her as a teacher, but if she could find one she could have a place in the school. She went out into the city and found children playing together in the streets, blacks and whites together. She asked them if they would come to her Sunday school class, and they said they would. She appointed the next Sunday to begin with the class. The mother of one little black girl who had been playing with the children in the street dressed her up in white and pink and sent her to the church, where she was met at the door by the Sunday school superintendent, who said: "We don't have negroes here." It broke that young woman's heart. Once with us, she became greatly interested in missions. I introduced her to the Board of Foreign Missions, and she was sent to Africa, and to-day she sleeps alongside the St. Paul River far back there in Africa. Many of the wild pagan tribes among whom she labored, together with the chief, came to her burial. A little window memorial has been put in one of our churches in Boston to her memory. Another thing: I never wanted any office. When on the floor of the General Conference I was first nominated as a candidate for Secretary of the Freeman's Aid Society, I declined it and said I had too much work at home and could not

accept it. Four years later Bishop Foster and others from Cincinnati waited on me and said that the Church needed me and wanted me in that Society. Under call, I consented and was elected. For eight years I suffered every abuse—God knows I count it to my honor—that could be heaped upon me by men who were as good as I am, but whose minds are still what the Northern mind once was on this question, but which, thank God, it is no longer. When this question of the status of the negro came up, I received letters from colored preachers and laymen all over the South, saying, “Haven’t we any friends left? Can you not say a word for us?” I have tried everywhere I have gone to speak for this class only as I would speak for the Indians or the Chinese. We dare not forget, as spiritually minded men, spiritually commissioned, that our mission is to all nations—all races, colors, and classes. The world is our parish. I was sent to the Pacific Coast, where I found some prejudice, possibly as intense prejudice, against the men from Asia. I shall never forget the men who walked the streets of San Francisco under a red flag and determined that the Chinese and Japanese should be driven out of this country. They appointed a committee of three men, every one of whom was born in a foreign country, and sent them to Washington to further their project. I was waited upon by Mr. Scott, the builder of the Oregon, and asked if I would not send a telegram of protest to Washington. I answered, No, but that I would join with him in such a telegram, that I was only there recently and possibly temporarily. I did join in a petition, and I did write to President Roosevelt and told him who the three men on the committee were and what it was proposed to do to the men who had helped our agricultural interests on the Pacific Coast more than any other set of men, and I have a letter from him in his own handwriting, saying, “I would rather have your advice than theirs, and I will attend to them when they come.” And he did. The first question he asked each one of them was where he was born, and those fellows, like the sheep of Little Bopeep, dejected and pondering, went home. It is not a question of the colored man alone; you have coupled him with foreign missions. It is a question of “Sub.” With the world engaged as it is, with this great sub and super battle now going on, I cannot afford to connect my name with any discrimination of my brother or any nation against anybody God has made. Whether in this country or any other, he is no lower or worse by nature than I am. God knows, if Jesus Christ had not died for every man—and He did not suffer more death for one man than another—I would not be here. I have never yet by any “consciousness” lifted myself above any other of human kind. The mission of Methodism is primarily to the poor. Now, coming down to the proposition before us, you have a question

of discrimination, I do not care whether you call it "Associate" or "Sub." It is separating from our fellowship men who have been connected with us for fifty years, men who have every right that I have, men who can go to the civil courts and put an injunction on any action we take here that will force them out against their will; and you are asking us, with our conceptions of the missionary message, to go against these brethren and in some way discriminate against them. You may dilute it as much as our homeopathic friends dilute their medicine, but there it is, call it what you want, it is taking away certain privileges that they have had for fifty years. I have a plan of my own—I don't care to introduce it yet, but I would be perfectly willing to bring it in here if it is wanted; but how can you ask us to give up all that we have stood for for fifty years? One of the best men here said to me on Monday: "I have no personal prejudices that would interfere with the relations of any member of your Church. The colored persons have their own congregations and their own Annual Conferences now. All the relation which is in controversy is the slight relation of a delegated membership in the government that covers the entire territory of the Church and all classes in it. You might as well come up here and ask us to turn the women out because you are not favorable to women in the General Conference. And if you were to ask us to do that, what claim could you present upon which to say it should be done except to say that certain prejudices among certain members of your people would make it impossible for you to unite? You brethren of the Church, South—who are our brethren—are representing certain frightfulness and terror behind you that, as you say, will lose two or three hundred thousand people. Are you sure of that? If you are, how about the loss of three hundred and fifty thousand from our membership? You tell me it is for the good of the black man, and the only single thing in our Church that you can hold up to us that we have not done for him is to elect him a general superintendent. We have given him every other position. One of our men said to me once: "Dr. Hamilton, how would you like to have a negro associated with you as a coördinate in the Freedmen's Aid Association?" I said: "Why not?" Thank God, for four years I have had associated with me a colored man who came to me as soon as I was elected and said: "I want you to give me directions." I said, "No," and never afterwards was there a question between us or a word between us that showed any difference of relations. I say the only question is the question of general superintendents. We have elected secretaries by the General Conference, we have elected bishops by the General Conference, and the only distinction is between missionary and general superintendents, and you want us to put these brethren out because they cannot culture

themselves and progress, because they do not have simply a general superintendency? Anybody who knows this Southern work as I know it (and I have no question but that Brother Leete has a larger share in the knowledge) will testify to you that there are no better negroes on the face of the earth than the negro preachers of our Conference. That has come about by mutual helpfulness. We have worked together, each helping the other, until we have this helpful and amicable condition of affairs. All I ask of you is to determine upon some plan that will not ask us to give up our missionary conception of the message of the Lord Jesus Christ when he said, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Then I ask you not to come and ask us after fifty years—against the universal protest, so far as we can determine it, of the people that are our children, that have been cultured in our Churches, though of their own selection, because they have not been able to secure thus far general superintendents—to tell them if they would go out from us they would make a progress that they have not been making and cannot make with us. I am ready with my little knowledge of history to go back to every single racial segregation on the face of the earth and show that races by mingling, by emigration have alone been able through mutual helpfulness to arrive at any sort of progress. Now, look at these two plans presented. I certainly cannot agree with the second of the two, and I do not want to agree to any Sub or Associate business in that first one. We can make such a reduction of the racial representation that will be universally applied to all races and all classes alike that will practically reach the same result you reach by your "Sub" and your "Associate." I do not believe in any arbitrary fixture of members. That is discrimination done for a purpose; but when we get together, your Church and ours, see the numbers we shall have; what is it that we cannot do with and for six million? But God forbid that I should ever have any such idea of unification as one of our men said to me when I was leaving home: "Think of six million people and the millions of money—why, we can take the world." God pity us if we ever have to rely only on princes and chariots and horses. When we come together, if we reduce the ratio of representation throughout the entire Church, yours from thirty and ours from forty-five down to one in ninety, if you please, that cuts down the ratio of our colored brethren, that cuts down the ratio of our foreign brethren, but in no sense discriminates against them any more than it does in cutting down your representation and ours, and it brings us into Christian relations with them in the General Conference, when they have no relations with us in local Church and Annual Conferences. At first they will not ask or need to

have many bishops; and while I have opposed it whenever and wherever it was proposed, I could be induced by our colored brethren in our General Conference to consent to the election of a missionary bishop or bishops for the races in Africa and in this country and thus give to the negroes a missionary bishop who would not have to preside over you Southern brethren; but I would do so only to secure unification. So far as the "principle" is presented in the preferential report, it would then be secured so far as the episcopacy is concerned, and the colored brethren would simply be related to you on the floor of the Conference in a proportionate reduction in the ratio of representation throughout the entire Church. If we can come to some such arrangement as will not ask discrimination against the negro and foreigner, if you can come to any plan that will leave us the fundamental conception of the gospel and the brotherly kindness we have sustained with all peoples for fifty years, I am with you. To the half of everything we have I am with you. You know my heart, and I would not for the world say a word that would create such a friction of spirit in mind or heart that I could not kneel at God's altar and take the holy communion with every member of this Commission and of our world Church.

H. M. Du Bose: First of all, I crave the privilege of reading the action of the last General Conference of the M. E. Church, South, on this question of unification:

However, we recommend that the colored membership of the various Methodist bodies be formed into an independent organization, holding fraternal relations with the reorganized and reunited Church.

I make three observations upon this action: (1) It was an afterthought. It came in at the end of a long history in the development of this sentiment and of these connections. It came at the end of the proceedings of the General Conference concerning this particular matter. (2) I call attention to the fact that it is a recommendation, that it was not to be understood to be a hard and fast requirement laid upon the Commissioners. I think that is well understood. If I do not forget both the language and the spirit of the answer given me by my colleague, Dr. Moore, who was on the committee that brought in the report, this is the case. (3) I call attention to the fact that that which is asked for is an organization and not a Church. I have already gone to record in the public prints of the Church, particularly those of the Church, North, on the line of this statement. I am more profoundly convinced to-day than ever before that I express the mind of my Church and my General Conference in saying that it was not an independent or separate Church, in the absolute sense of the term, that was asked for; but the General Conference recommended this organization with a view to securing the

largest realization of the ideal that has been operative in the Southern mind all the time and that gathers force as time goes by, expressive of our profoundest conviction of self-interest and of justice to the colored man—that is, that his opportunities should be enlarged, all his opportunities, and particularly his religious opportunities. Now, permit me to speak to the point of the action of the committee in the report which is pending. It is a happy circumstance when one's profoundest convictions or self-interest coincide with his deepest feelings of altruism. And my thoughts concerning the matter of the status of the colored man in the reorganized Methodist Church have delivered me upon this broad platform of happiness and confidence. I profoundly believe that my own interests in this matter are the largest interests of the colored man. I am mastered and possessed of the thought that I owe much to the negro, and I am equally mastered and possessed of the thought that the negro owes much to me. I owe much to him and to his race, and he owes an equal consideration to me and to my race. I owe to the negro not only the privilege of a place in the sun of industrial liberty and competition, but I owe to him a large helpfulness that he may attain in social, intellectual, and spiritual matters. He owes to me and to my race to be left to work out those possibilities and destinies which are involved in the history of his race and mine. Particularly he owes to me elbowroom in which to work out all those great matters which will enable me to deliver myself and my race upon the task of enlarging his interest and maintaining the happier ends of his experience. An unnatural relationship of the colored race, or any race, to me and to my race, or any unnatural relationship of me and my race to any other race or color, as demonstrated by the history of progress, is an abridgment of the possibilities of that other race itself. It is a restriction of his privileges and a breaking down of the possibilities of his attainment in the larger sense. And the subordination of the colored race to me or my race is a limitation upon me, an incubus upon the opportunities I have for serving him and for serving myself. This brings me, therefore, to the consideration of the larger matter of the reports. Not only the issue that is in my mind, but the whole question involved in the discussion of the unification of the two great American Churches lies between these reports. I see the need for this unification of American Methodism. It has laid hold upon me with a grasp that is titanic. I have beenwhelmed by it. I feel the cosmic force of the thought that surrounds it. I passed through a California earthquake and saw the hills and mountains reel and the floods themselves rise up in frothy hands, and nothing seemed steadfast save the clear, still stars in the heavens. I stood at the bottom of Indio basin, three hundred feet below sea level, and

saw the five Jovian satellites and the Pleiades and Orion as it were within hand touch. I was marooned in a great Northwestern fire, when it seemed the world was being consumed. I passed through the rigors of a North Dakota blizzard. I can never be the same man I was before I went through that California earthquake experience, the Indio basin vision, the Northwest forest fire, and the rigors of that North Dakota snow storm. I can never any more be the same man I was before into our midst was flung, like a burning star, this great concrete suggestion of the unification of American Methodism. It has become a fire in my bones, a sword driven through my cranial bone. It has become iron in my blood and a fire in my brain. I feel a fellowship with the great forces of nature by having passed through those mighty cataclysms; and I have mingled with the universe. And now, passing this experience of four years, and particularly the intensified experiences of these recent months, I affirm a new sense of universal brotherhood and sympathy, and I have been led to the largest conclusion by most careful personal reflection and analysis of this world thought, this great age-thought, that has come upon me. I see things from the missionary viewpoint in the same light in which my brother, Bishop Hamilton, sees them. I can match, case for case, along a series of years, if not to the ultimate, the stories of self-dedication which he has cited. I know, in the city of Augusta, in this State of Georgia, a young woman, a daughter of a Southern family, in whose veins runs a blood as blue as Italian skies, the blood of generations of Southern planters, who for near a dozen years has veiled her face and has caused to be disowned her own self, and given that self to settlement work among the colored people of that city. I know one of the bravest and truest young men of the South who is to-day sitting as President of Paine College, devoting his noble talents and splendid manhood, character, and life to the cause of the colored people. This is a question of missionary devotion. The other is a detail of the adjustment of the larger lines of relationship in the organized Church throughout the world. When this great world debacle of blood is over, when this world war is ended, there will be moral bankruptcy in the nations of Europe, as there also will be social disorder. America is to be looked to, not only to furnish the money and bread and foodstuffs for these nations, but also to be the teacher and their helper. Startling and strange as the thought may be, the primacy of thought will have departed from Germany. The disordered condition of her educational institutions will cause the primacy to depart to some other land. Possibly it will come to us. Certainly it will at least be divided between us and the schools of the British Empire. To meet this exigency will require not only a vast amount of money

but a vast amount of devotion. Methodism is the largest religious element represented on this continent; but in its divided and disunited condition to-day it cannot meet the need. But American civilization—Anglo-Saxon civilization—in this land needs a united Methodism. We need it for the organization of a great university movement. We need it for the purpose of putting forward the schemes for the aggrandizement and enlargement of those forces already operating. America is to furnish the scholars and the thinkers of the new age. A new philosophy is to be written for the world; a new theology, so far as theology is a science, is to be constructed for the world; and it must be done largely by the scholars and the students and the teachers of this Western continent. We shall need the alignment of all our forces. And now I come to the crucial thought in this plan of unification. The backward races of the world need a united Methodism; not only this colored race, these descendants of the men of Africa, but all the backward races need what can come fully only with reorganized Methodism in this country. Then, these large missionary movements and these large missionary ideals will be realized. The M. E. Church, South, in the last dozen years, and especially in these very recent years, as a result of conviction and profound apprehension of historic duty, has enlarged its missionary borders and advanced its lines far out into the wilds of Africa. It proposes to share with its sister Methodism in the North, if we continue dissevered as in the past, in this work in Africa, and we have large numbers of clever members in South America and in Cuba. We are not afraid of these missionary obligations. There are missionary demands everywhere, and some in the prosecution of which we must subordinate policy. From a missionary viewpoint, we shall not fail, I am sure, in the presence of our duty to brush aside difficulties from the clear path Providence has marked out for us. But the matter of the settlement of the lines of Church relationship is a question for Christian statesmanship, manifested not only, on the part of the superior race, if one race be superior to the other, but of the backward races, the black race, or the red race, or the brown race. Now, Mr. Chairman, I sum up my review of this matter in these words: Not only have I apprehended the need of the unification of American Methodism, but I have apprehended the course which I think it must take prophetically and historically. The course it must take is, first of all, an accentuation and enlargement of all schemes for evangelism in our own country. United Methodism will give impetus to the evangelistic movement on this continent. It will fulfill the dream of our founder, "The world is my parish." Not only that: it will manifest and accentuate the ethics and charity of American Christianity. It will make both effective. And then it will put us, if

we follow the line which, according to my humble judgment, is clearly marked by Providence, and which to me seems to be the only possible line—if we follow that line, then it will put us in the way to a larger ministry to our colored brethren in this country, as also to the members of all other races than the Anglo-Saxon or Aryan race. So my mind has been led for some weeks past to the accepting of the alternative plan, that for a separate General Conference. I do not think the expression of my Church in General Conference, which I have read, shuts us up to any particular plan. It only indicates the general idea that we are expected to follow, the general results that we were asked to seek to reach in these deliberations. To my mind, the acceptance of the second of these plans is the one that is most natural, most workable, and that will be satisfactory to the largest number in both Churches; and the one which I am constrained to believe in the near future will become satisfactory to our brethren of African descent as well. A colored bishop, of course not a colored bishop of the M. E. Church, but of the Colored M. E. Church, said some time ago in an address or paper that which was doubly interesting to me because it showed that he had at least read his Greek Testament. It was with reference to the passage in which the Lord, as the language is usually translated, said to the demoniac: "Go to thy kindred or to thy house and tell them what great things the Lord hath done for thee." He called attention to the fact that the word in the original Greek was *oikios*, and not *oikia*, and, therefore, he translated it: "Go to thy race and tell them what great things the Lord has done for thee." I am not responsible for that argument. He constructed it himself. And so, thanking you cordially for your indulgence, I seek to emphasize my own belief, which I am convinced is largely shared by my brethren, and I think by many of the people North, that we do the greatest possible justice to our colored brothers in setting them up in a separate organization, maintaining with them the most direct and confidential fraternal relations, leaving them to share in the usufruct of the property which is theirs, as ours, and has been theirs for years, and also to continue to foster and sustain the enterprises of their Church by larger gifts in the future than in the past, and also by retaining close contact with them, keeping both divisions of the Church as one—the same Church, but its two parts set up side by side, where there will be constant interchange of mutual sentiments and sympathy and where each will work out his largest problems, but remaining mutually helpful in a common task.

W. N. Ainsworth: I rise for the purpose of asking the Chair or the Committee on Rules if there is any limitation upon debate under the rules of the house.

H. M. Du Bose: I was afraid that would be asked before I got through. What is the rule?

Bishop Leete: I have just read the rule, and there is a limit on debate; but I call attention to the fact that no attempt has been made up to this time to follow the rule. The brothers who have already spoken have had all the time they desired; and as we want to get all the information we can on these subjects, and as no one will be hurt by a day or two of extra time spent here, I suggest that the rest of the brothers have the same privilege of unlimited time extended to them as has been accorded to those who have already spoken.

Bishop Hamilton: I certainly beg pardon for having taken so much time. I did not know the rule. But I am opposed now to limiting any other member.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): In answer to Dr. Ainsworth's question, which is a perfectly proper one, there is a rule limiting speeches to ten minutes; but I did not have my watch open, and I may say frankly, purposely I relied on the Commission to call my attention to the lapse of time. Nobody called my attention to the lapse of time, and officially I do not know that anybody spoke over ten minutes.

Bishop McDowell: I move, for the purposes of this debate, until further action is taken, that the rule limiting speeches to ten minutes be suspended.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Bishop Mouzon: I have been deeply interested in the speeches just made by Bishop Hamilton and by my colleague, Dr. Du Bose, but more especially in the speech made by Bishop Hamilton. And before attempting to say anything which looks in the direction of constructive suggestion, Bishop Hamilton will pardon me and the Commission will pardon me, if I say something by way of reply to the speech made a moment ago by Bishop Hamilton. That was a most delightful speech, Bishop. I enjoyed it very much. Indeed, if you will pardon me, I will say it was delightful for its *naïveté*. The good Bishop is certainly consistent with himself; and for one, I love to find a man who is always the same, and whose convictions to-day are identical with his convictions fifty years ago. That has always interested me; and it is the more interesting because I find my own opinions changing with the course of years. And so it is the more interesting to find my distinguished friend holding the views to-day which were held by the extreme abolitionists before I was born. The good Bishop said a moment ago that evidently the general attitude of the members of the M. E. Church, South, toward the colored man is to-day just what the attitude of the slaveholder in the North fifty years ago was. Now, I was not alive fifty years ago. It will be a year yet before I shall be fifty

years old, and I am not quite sure just what the attitude of the slaveholder in the North before the abolition of slavery was. But I do protest—I do emphatically protest—that my good friend Bishop Hamilton is in error at that point. I am not quite sure just what the view was, but I know what the good Bishop's view at the present time is and what he supposes that view to have been, and, therefore, I am protesting that that is not my attitude and it is not the attitude of the members of the M. E. Church, South, toward the colored man. The good Bishop remarked that the view he holds—I believe he used the plural—that “the view we hold grows out of our experience of regeneration. ‘We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren.’” Now, there are some of us who humbly hope that we ourselves have been born again, and we ourselves would most modestly affirm that “we know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren.” We love the white brethren, all of them—some more than others; and we love the colored brethren also. And I will add that I am a little unwilling for anybody to love the colored man any more than I love him. I said a moment ago that my good friend Bishop Hamilton was entirely consistent. Now, his speech would have had more effect on me, and would have had more effect on the members of the Commission which I represent, and you will permit me to say, I fancy it would have had more effect on these colored brethren who are here, if the Church which Bishop Hamilton represents had been just as consistent in its practice as Bishop Hamilton has been in his preaching. Do we not all know that the color line runs all the way through the M. E. Church? Do we not know that it has become more and more deeply drawn with the progress of the years? Certainly, we all know that. So, in spite of the good Bishop's remark that the progress of the race is to take place by associating together and by the commingling of the races, the M. E. Church does not believe that just as he does, and I am sure my colored brethren do not believe it. And I shall have to add this: I am quite sure that if Bishop Hamilton is the spokesman to-day for the M. E. Church, we still hope to put a period to our negotiations right here. But I was never more hopeful in my life, because I have not the remotest idea that he is the spokesman for his Commission—none in the world. However, I do love to see a consistent man, who is a good man and who loves everybody, making such a splendid *apologia pro vita sua* as he did a moment ago. So here we are this morning, and I think we are making progress and we are going to make more progress to-day. As we came in a moment ago, while we were assembling, one of my colleagues said to me as he put his hand on my shoulder, “I am very solemn to-day.” This is indeed a serious hour in the his-

tory of American Methodism. But instead of being so "solemn" over it, my faith rises to-day and I face the future filled with larger hope than I have ever had that by the grace of God and by the guidance of his Spirit we are going to be led into a large place. I believe in my heart that Christianity cannot possibly fly any national flag and that it cannot possibly fly any racial flag; and I believe in my heart that Methodism must not fly any national flag nor any racial flag either. And it does not. The Methodism I represent does not. And if we are true to ourselves the Methodism of the future will not fly any racial or national flag. Dr. Du Bose read to you a moment ago the action taken by the General Conference of the M. E. Church, South. There are some of us who feel that we are not at liberty to adopt just any plan of unification that might be suggested here. Indeed, I have no idea that any member of the Commission of which I am a member feels that he is at liberty to vote for just any plan of unification that may be suggested. We must vote in view of what has already been done. Certain basic principles of unification have, after the lapse of years of conference one with the other, been wrought out; and whatsoever we do must be done in view of, and in the light of, those great basic principles of unification which have already been agreed upon, and which have entered into the paper adopted by the General Conference of the M. E. Church, South, and by the General Conference of the M. E. Church. Now, I have felt from the beginning that when I accepted membership on this Commission I was under orders, that my Church was saying to me: "You must labor to do something, you must labor to invent a plan in harmony with these general principles, and you must work at it until you can bring back a report to the General Conference that the General Conference can vote on." Toward that end I have been laboring day after day and month after month. Now, it will be recalled by this Joint Commission that when we first came together in Baltimore the Chairman of the Commission of the M. E. Church, South, submitted a brief paper, a paper that had been, so far as I know, unanimously agreed upon by the members of the Southern Commission, stating in effect that we felt ourselves to be bound by certain basic principles: and one of those principles was that "the colored members of the M. E. Church, and of such colored Churches as might elect to take part in the reorganization of American Methodism, were to be dealt with in such manner as to give full recognition to race consciousness while at the same time bringing to them the largest and most brotherly cooperation." I am quoting almost literally. It was after considerable discussion that the Commission of the M. E. Church, South, adopted just that phraseology, and that form of phraseology was adopted with two things in view: in order that we

might have an interpretation of the powers that had been committed to us by the General Conference, and in order also to give a working formula that might fit not one thing merely but that might fit something else also, that might enable us to hit upon some plan that would meet the conditions laid down by the General Conference of the M. E. Church, South, without going to the extreme of saying that the colored membership of the M. E. Church and of colored Churches that might see fit to come into union had to be organized into an entirely separate ecclesiasticism. Now, if we have properly interpreted the meaning of the General Conference, if we have properly interpreted the mind of the people that we represent, we do not come to you with any such ultimatum as that and say that we will agree to nothing that does not separate your colored membership entirely from you. My dear brethren, I believe that the time has come when the people of the South, instead of endeavoring to get further from the colored people, are divinely called to get closer to the colored people. As I go about the connection, as I write and talk to the people of the Church that I love better than I do my life, I find everywhere the conviction that we should hit upon some plan by which to get closer to the colored people and not some plan by which to get further away from the colored people. I have living near me one of the superannuated ministers of our Church, Dr. John H. McLean, for many years the President of the Southwestern University, one of the great men of our Church. Although in his eightieth year, he is alive and in sympathy with this present world in which he lives. He and I were talking about this matter the other day when he was at my house, and he gave me this leaf out of his experience. He said: "There was a slave in my father's family. We grew up together and played together; I loved him and he loved me. After the war he moved away, but I loved him still and he loved me. By and by he died and the family telegraphed me to ask that I come and conduct his funeral service. I went a distance of fifty or seventy-five miles. I preached the sermon and conducted the services. As I was going to the station, his son, himself a grown man, was carrying my grip. Presently he stopped still, put the grip down, looked at me, and said: 'Dr. McLean, I have known all my life that my father loved you. I have heard him talk about you and I knew his devotion to you. But to-day I have discovered that you also loved my father, else you would not have come down this long distance to the funeral of a colored man. You would not have spoken as you did about him, if you had not loved my father. I know now you loved my father.'" "Then," said Dr. McLean, "he paused a moment and, looking me squarely in the face, said: 'Dr. McLean, you loved my father; but where is the white man who loves me?'" I fear there are numbers of

colored men in our Southland and elsewhere who deep down in their hearts are feeling and saying, "Where is the white man who really loves me?" And so I am convinced that what is needed to-day is to get closer to the colored people and not farther from them; and if there is any man in the M. E. Church, South, who does not believe that, I have never heard him speak on the subject. Of course, all might be entirely willing to accept everything I have just now said, and then from that point we might diverge; some of us believe that one method was the best to show it, and others believe that another method would be the best way to show it. Now, speaking out of my heart some things that I have been thinking about recently, I go further. I am very much afraid (and if I am in error I should like to be set right)—I am very much afraid that the two races are not drawing closer together, but that they are drifting a little farther apart. I am afraid that there is not intimacy between them that there used to be. I am afraid that certain suspicions exist in the minds of the colored people in reference to white people of the South. I am afraid also that there are certain colored Methodist Churches that do not have that fraternal feeling toward the white man they ought to have, that do not look upon the white man as their friend, and that are not friendly to the white man. I have been talking to some of our men who have had some experience and they tell me that this is probably true. Now, these two races must live together, work out their destinies together, and go to heaven together; and whatever we do, we must do not only with the good of the white man in view, but with the good of the colored man in view. You cannot adopt a plan that is good for the white man unless it is also good for the colored man; and you cannot adopt a plan that is good for the colored man unless it is also good for the white man. It is perfectly evident from what has been said here this morning that some of us are as wide as the poles apart. There are some of us who do believe that it is best for the colored man that his race consciousness should be always recognized, and that his racial identity should be maintained down to the last syllable of time. There are some of us who believe that what has been talked about as social equality is not desired by the best people among the colored race. Now, if I may be pardoned, a certain member of the Commission, representing the M. E. Church, spoke to me very plainly about that, and said that the doctrine of social equality is not the doctrine of Christ, but of Rousseau, but I believe this to be the truth. What do we desire? We desire that every man, no matter what his color may be, shall have a man's chance to work out a man's destiny and do a man's work in the world. I am a much younger man than the honored Bishop who spoke first, therefore I have left far behind me certain things that some older men have not left behind them. I have

a yearning desire to do more for the colored man than I have ever done. I recognize that I have not done what I might have done, but I have hardly known how to go at it. I have hardly had the opportunity to do the things that in my heart I desire to do. Now, dear brethren, if we are to get together, we must make certain compromises. You must make some compromises; we must make some compromises. You can ask no man to surrender any principle that he considers to be vital or fundamental. We cannot ask you to do that; you cannot ask us to do it. But, I repeat, we must make some compromises. I remember that our fathers, the framers of the Constitution of the United States, would never have gotten together if they had not made some compromises, some of them the most illogical compromises in the world; and it may be that we shall have to make some compromises here that are not altogether logical, but if we can get together let us make the necessary compromises. I am willing to make compromises that do not affect fundamental principles. Of course, there will always be men who will insist that fundamental principles are affected and who will not yield anything whatever. But I have felt, with the fathers of our American Constitution, that such compromises must sometimes be made, and that we are really here to use our wits. Now, before I sit down, permit me to make one or two quotations, without having up to the present time expressed my preference for the one plan or the other. At the Constitutional Convention of 1787, when Patterson and certain of the irreconcilables were urging that the convention was going beyond its powers, Randolph made this answer: "When the salvation of the Republic is at stake, it would be treason to our trust not to propose what we find necessary." And when the future of American Methodism—I will not say that—but when the best interests of Methodism seem to be at stake, when the best interests of America seem to be at stake, I believe it would be nothing less than treason to our trust not to propose what we find to be necessary to do this thing. Another quotation: Hamilton said that "they were there for the purpose of recommending a scheme which would have to be submitted to the States for acceptance, and therefore they need not be deterred by any false scruples from using their wits to the best possible advantage." And I would remind you, gentlemen, that whatsoever we do here must be submitted to the General Conference and then to the Annual Conferences, and therefore we do not need to scruple, we may use our wits to the best possible advantage to do the thing that is desired by the Churches that we represent. It is the earnest desire of our people that we may find a way by which we may get together. I have earnestly prayed—I continually pray—that light from on high may come to us and that we may be willing to follow the Divine guidance.

And I do here now—as I am sure you do—put myself in Divine hands. May God use me and use you that this thing may be accomplished.

Bishop Cranston: Brethren, you were somewhat late getting here this morning. It was a quarter to ten o'clock before we began the session and it is not more than twenty minutes past twelve now. I really feel, and I have heard others express themselves that way too, that we had better have our morning session open at ten and continue until one rather than half past nine to half past twelve. Therefore, I want to move that this session continue until one o'clock and that hereafter we shall meet at ten o'clock and adjourn at one. We don't get the time for the exercise in the morning that we absolutely need in order to be in shape to best discharge our duties. We have to come directly from the breakfast table here.

John M. Moore: I wish Bishop Cranston would not insist upon that for to-morrow morning.

Edgar Blake: And I wish he would not insist on it for to-day. We have had a pretty strenuous morning. I don't know how the other members have been affected, but in giving the close attention that I have endeavored to give to every one of these addresses my mind is just a bit weary at the present time. I think it would be wise for us and fairer to the gentlemen who want to be heard if we would adjourn now and let the brothers who are to speak come to us with our minds fresh for the messages they bring. Of course, it is too late now for any one to speak before adjournment. Instead of extending the time until one o'clock, I hope, in view of our mental fatigue, that we may adjourn now, and I make that motion.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The hymn, "My faith looks up to Thee," was sung, and the Commission was dismissed with the benediction by Dr. Randall.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Commission was called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Denny.

Dr. Van Cleve read the third chapter of Colossians and offered prayer.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): We have been reading the minutes first and then calling the roll. It seems to me that it would be more satisfactory to call the roll before reading the minutes. That will determine whether there is a quorum present. The Secretary will be kind enough to call the roll.

The roll was called and the following were present: Bishops Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. A. Candler, W. B. Murah, James Atkins, Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. Mc-

Dowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Ministers: Frank M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar, Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. W. Van Cleve, J. J. Wallace. Laymen: M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White, G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, H. W. Rogers, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock.

The minutes of the morning session were read and approved.

Bishop Cranston took the chair.

Secretary Harris read a communication from Mr. Rule, also a communication from William H. Davie, Secretary of the Official Board, St. Louis.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): When the Commission adjourned, the discussion of the report of the Committee on the Status of the Negro was proceeding and that is still the order.

Dr. Downey: I suppose somebody has to begin the afternoon session, and possibly I might as well say what is in my heart to say now as at any other time. It must, I think, be evident to every Commissioner that we have come to the point when the decisions made will cause us to go either backward or forward. I desire to speak as one who has a forward look and who earnestly and prayerfully and hopefully desires that we may reach conclusions that shall help us forward. I trust that I may be kept, both by good sense and God's grace, from saying anything that would in any way make for either a backward look or a backward movement. I think I shall preface what I have to say by reading the essential parts of a brief letter which I have received since coming here. This letter was written by one of our younger preachers whose pastorate is in a border city where the matter of Church division is quite acute. I shall omit in the reading of the letter everything that I do not deem essential:

During the past year I have associated in various capacities among laymen and ministers in Annual Conferences, college and seminary commencements, Epworth League institutes, summer assemblies, union evangelistic meetings, and the general amount of lecture, address, dinner, and similar engagements which fall to the lot of an average pastor and preacher. These engagements have taken me into Pennsylvania, New York, Indiana, Michigan, Colorado, Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Iowa, Nebraska, and California. Wherever I have gone I have listened carefully and, so far as the talent has been provided me, inquired discreetly on every occasion at which the matter of unification was being discussed or could be introduced. So far as I have been able to formulate the results, I have discovered as follows:

- I. A thoroughly earnest body of Methodists who frankly want unification on any terms, as they say, but who do not concern themselves with what "any terms" may involve.

2. A larger, thoroughly earnest body of Methodists who are for unification *per se*, and who do not see any reason for "terms" of any kind; who do not understand that there are any elements involved other than the coming together of the two denominations by a complete merging of forces and institutions, with no thought of areas, minorities, color lines, *et al.*

3. A group of equally earnest Methodists, larger than the first group, not so large as the second, who recognize the factors of adjustment to be considered, who want unification and who will accept some less simple form than the ideal of the second group, but who will not consent to any unification which involves a practical disintegration of Methodism on the one hand and a discrimination against the negro in this country on the other.

From these discoveries and my observation among them I make bold to conclude: That when the complete subject is laid before the Church, with all the elements of debate plain and the issues clearly drawn, Group No. 2 will move over to the position of Group No. 3, as will a fair percentage of Group No. 1.

This means several things. First of all, it means that any plan of union which the Commission may adopt, which discriminates against the negro and in which the negro does not voluntarily and gladly acquiesce, will be repudiated by the Church. It means also that in a day when the world is thundering the message of internationalism and inter-racialism, which is bringing home as never before the immeasurable need for a world-wide Church with truly world-visioned leaders, any plan of unification which would make for a new provincialism by jurisdictional areas, with jurisdictional leaders, altogether rendering inevitable the parochial mind, will be either defeated, or accepted by so scant a majority and such absence of enthusiasm as to doom such a union to failure from the start. And this does not take account of the futility with which such a self-provincialized Church would appeal to a world already far in advance of it in social theory and practice.

I do not make every sentence of this my own. I read it because it seems to me to be a pretty fair diagnosis of a fairly wide and general situation, and I think we ought to have all possible light. Now, as to the immediate question which is before us: The negroes in the Methodist Church have a certain position. They are in the Church. Quite naturally our preference is that they be continued in the relation in which they now are. We do not see any very good reason for a change. It ought, however, to be clearly in mind as to just what the *status quo* is and what it implies. It does not imply social equality. This is not a matter that is at all before us. Social equality is something that takes care of itself. It is really hardly a matter to be considered by thoughtful men who are handling Church matters. Again, the *status quo* does not mean mixed Churches or mixed Conferences. Of course, there will be sporadic instances in which there may be a few negro members in some Churches of the South as well as of the North. Indeed, from what I have heard, I imagine you have far more of these sporadic instances than we have. I think we should bear these matters clearly in our thought. It is not a question of mixed Churches, it is not a question of social

equality, it is not a question of mixed races. These things are not at all in our thought. They are not in the mind or conscience of the M. E. Church. It simply means ecclesiastical equality. That is all. Now, it has been said here and said, I believe, with a good deal of truth, that the color line is already drawn in the M. E. Church. This is unquestionably true. We have colored Churches, we have colored Conferences, and we have colored ministers in our Annual Conferences, ministering only and always to colored congregations. But we do not need to be misled by this. This is largely just the same color line that you have here. But there is no color line in the M. E. Church on the manhood rights of the negro in the Church. That is the point—that is the main point in our Church. He has all the rights of a minister. He has his judicial rights, his legislative rights, his right to appointment, his right to appeal, and everything of that sort. It is not a color line on the question of his manhood rights and his manhood standing, and I do not think the M. E. Church would be willing to write into the Constitution of the reorganized Church anything that would be a discrimination upon the manhood rights of any man in the reorganized Church. There is no discrimination against the rights of the negro in the Constitution of the United States. There is no discrimination on his manhood rights, I take it, in the various States. I do not believe that you would expect that we should write into the Constitution of the reorganized Church of Jesus Christ what is not written into the constitutions of the States and the Nation. A good deal has been said about the necessity of setting the colored brother apart in an associated or independent General Conference in order that he may have racial development. It is easily possible, brothers, in these days to overstrain the matter of racial development. The fact is, the world to-day is suffering from an excess of racialism—from an exaggerated sense of racialism—and we shall do well to be on our guard lest we go too far in that direction. I suppose what is meant is that he should have an opportunity for self-development; but I call attention to the fact that in the M. E. Church at the present time he has autonomy in the local Church. Nobody interferes with his development in the local Church or with the management of his affairs in the local Church; nobody interferes seriously with his management of affairs in the Annual Conference. Indeed, I think it would have been better if we had given a little more attention to him in his management of affairs in his Annual Conference. But the fact is that he has been allowed pretty much to have his own way. He controls his Annual Conference; he carries on the business of his Annual Conference. It has been my privilege as a connec-tional officer to visit a number of our colored Conferences. I have listened to reports of their district superintendents. I

have listened to their discussions and their debates, and I make bold to say that they do not seem to suffer because of any pressure that was put upon them by the bishop who happened to be presiding. I make bold to say that they gave evidence of development and of wisdom and of careful thought and ability in their discussions. I have heard white men who have made no better presentations of their causes than many of these black men. They have a good deal of autonomy in their affairs at present. They control a great many educational institutions that do really high and serviceable work. Now, we are asked to believe that an independent General Conference, meeting once in four years, will be the capstone to all that I have mentioned. I beg leave to differ with that. I believe his presence in the General Conference as now constituted is just the one thing he needs to give him ideals and suggestions and helpful inspirations which he can take down to his educational institutions, to the Annual and District Conferences, and to his local Church. I am perfectly confident that meeting once in four years cannot by any possibility do for him in an educational way or in an inspirational way what his association with men who have had a much longer and finer chance for civilization than he has had can do for him. Now, as regards the preferential plan which is before us—I was greatly interested in Bishop Mouzon's statement or explanation of a statement made by Bishop Candler when we assembled in Baltimore. If I misunderstood his explanation, I am sure he will correct me. As I gathered it, his statement meant, indeed I think he plainly stated that that deliverance was so framed as not to make the suggestions of the General Conference of the M. E. Church, South, for an independent body for the negroes, an ultimatum. I think that was the statement, and I am very glad to have that statement made. I think I may say for the Commissioners of the M. E. Church that we do not consider that the deliverance of our General Conference at Saratoga, asking for a Regional Conference on a parity with the other Regional Conferences, is in any sense an ultimatum. It is an ideal; it is unquestionably the thing we would like. Now, we have two statements there, neither of them in the nature, it seems to me, of an ultimatum. We have before us the preferential plan, and it occurs to me that that preferential plan may be the middle ground on which we can agree. It is not all we would like it to be. There are certain things in it that I certainly hope will be changed. But as I look it over, taking all the elements into consideration, it seems to me that it points in the right direction, and that it might be perfectly possible with a reasonable amount of sacrifice and of compromise to come to unity on something akin to that preferential plan. Brothers, we ought not to divest ourselves of the age spirit. We cannot

if we will. We are in a great human movement. The movement toward democracy was never so strong as it is to-day. The sense of humanity never bulked so large. These men, darker skinned than we are, are in the battle line. They are fighting side by side with and shoulder to shoulder with our boys in the trenches, and when the grim crisis comes on some field of Flanders or elsewhere we shall find that their blood will mingle with the blood of our brothers and our sons. They will be just as true and as loyal to them and to our country as by unimpeachable testimony their ancestors were true and loyal to your homes and families in the dark days of civil strife. Brothers, we cannot agree here without sacrifice, without giving up some things that we hold dear.

"Life evermore is fed by death,
In earth and sea and sky,
And that a rose may breathe its breath
Some thing must die."

Our preferences, our prejudices, our preconceived plans may all have to die: They may go into the crucible, but if out of that crucible there shall come a new Church, warm with Christ's love, radiant with Christ's hope, powerful through the incarnation of Christ's sacrifice, we shall have accomplished a great work and shall deserve well of our generation.

The hymn, "Blest be the tie that binds," was sung.

Prayer was offered by Dr. Bishop.

Bishop Denny took the chair.

Bishop Cranston: I had not designed to make any remarks this afternoon, being in the chair. And yet, while we should always be in such a frame of mind as to profitably employ or enjoy a period of silence at a time like this, I take it that we all expect in some way to express ourselves, not on everything at one time, but as opportunity may offer or occasion demand during the progress of our deliberations. There are among our people too many who fancy that because everything for which the Churches are striving, and which we are sincerely desiring, has not been more speedily realized. Such careless observers have failed to perceive what has really been gained. I think the fellowship that is exhibited here is an evidence of the progress that has been made, and I find great encouragement as I contrast the attitude of mind as here represented by the Commissioners of both Churches and our lively expectation concerning the great matter in hand, with the absolute reluctance with which at first the Commissions approached the discussion of terms of union. Recalling the Baltimore meeting in 1910, it then appeared to be almost impossible that such a state of earnest desire and hope could obtain as we realized at Traverse City or even in the second Baltimore meeting. You see, when we came

to the point where we were not afraid to look each other in the face and take hold of the questions which had separated the Churches, and to confess the unchristian contentions by which our energies had been diverted and our resources neutralized, when we once came to the point where we could, as Bishop Hoss said, take all the plain words either side cared to say, we had made a start. At the second Baltimore meeting we went so far as to declare our mutual confidence in each other as Churches, which expression was very heartily and unanimously indorsed by both General Conferences represented in the Commission. To my thought that was a tremendous gain. And so we are here, brethren, not in the frame in which union was first talked about in a practical way at the first Baltimore meeting in 1910, but inspired to effort by the very remarkable concessions and declarations of our ruling bodies as to the apostolic character and Methodistic integrity of both Churches. When Bishop Mouzon this morning referred to Bishop Hamilton's use of the word "regeneration" in his address preceding, and declared his belief that some of the brethren of the Southern Church had passed through that experience, of course we all smiled. But I want to say, Bishop Mouzon, that that really was a work of supererogation. We need not be trying here to prove up any claim of great sanctity, because the two General Conferences we represent have settled that matter for us. I want you to remember that the M. E. Church, South, has certified in regard to the Church we represent that it is soundly Methodistic and historic equally with your Church; and that it is apostolic—let us get the full meaning of that word. Then, I want the brethren of our Commission to understand, on the other hand, that our Church has declared solemnly by a vote of the General Conference, unchallenged by anybody, that the M. E. Church, South, has the same historic and apostolic footing which it claims for itself. We have no questions of that kind to settle here. I suppose there was really a time when it was hard for some of the Methodists, North, to believe that there were really any genuine Methodists in the South, as there was a time when it was difficult for the brethren of the South to believe there was anything up North except the basest political heresy and a suspicious type of regeneration. But that has all gone by. If we could all maintain the consciousness of the interchurch situation as developed by the General Conferences' action, and so thoroughly certified that no man here can challenge it, we could more safely indulge the pleasantries which tend to relieve the tension of serious discussion. Brethren, this is a blessed mood in which we find ourselves as we come together to test the genuineness of our Methodist brotherly love and to confront together hopefully and in a spirit of generous concession the difficulties that

beset our progress. If we could only communicate this spirit to all the people whom we represent, not only organic union but complete union of spirit would quickly follow. As we talk about our missionary obligations, it comes into my mind that perhaps we have some missionary duties toward the masses of people who compose these two great Methodist bodies. I venture as an expression of open belief that the masses of the membership of these two Churches are Methodists in the sense that, having identified themselves with Methodist Churches, they have come to believe in Methodist ways; they are helped by the fellowship of Methodist altars and they would not consent to be called by any other name. They have not gone exploring to find what conditions or reasons separate them from other great bodies of Methodist people. As an evidence of that, when our people come South they drift into the Churches of the South, and many of your people who come North find places in our Churches where there is no organization of their own Church, and they do not know the difference in the pastors, they do not seek to know the difference between the two communions. The people do not care for those things about which we are troubled. We can go home and place before them, if we are so inclined, such representations of the differences by which the Churches have been divided and of the lines of cleavage that we are trying to close up here and make impressions that will tend to make permanent all those unhappy factors of the situation against which we are contending. On the other hand, we can come together on some footing that represents concessions on both sides. I do not believe we can make any headway before the people with a proposition that carries on its face a spirit of unfairness. I do not believe that either Church would feel contented in the reorganized Church unless its representatives had made a fair share of the concessions in order to attain so great an end. I think that is a spiritual as well as a psychological inference. So we may have some missionary work to do, not only with each other but with those whom we represent. It would be a great work. "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God." And we can be peacemakers at home as well as peacemakers here. I have said all I care to say. I did not wish to see the time go by unimproved. I greatly enjoyed the speeches this morning. I do not think my Brother Hamilton ever showed to better advantage than he did in that fine address he gave us, and Dr. Du Bose never better revealed the workings of his great mind and greater heart. And Dr. Moore always stirs our better natures to action, while Bishop Mouzon moves on with confident step to his conclusions. But I fear that he did not do Bishop Hamilton justice in his remarks concerning Bishop Hamilton's attitude in that he for-

got the pregnant sentences with which Bishop Hamilton closed. When John W. Hamilton comes to the point that he can be content with something less than the full measure of consideration toward the black man, he has come a great way. I doubt if any man of his antecedents can make more concession than did Bishop Hamilton when he said that he could, for harmony's sake, accept less than full numerical representation for the negro. I submit that Bishop Hamilton did a great thing this morning, and I want Bishop Mouzon to take measure of it and then allow Bishop Hamilton to think about everything else as he did fifty years ago.

Bishop Mouzon: I desire to thank Bishop Cranston, whom we all love, and love more and more the longer we know him, for adding that very beautiful postscript to my speech this morning. That was a rather surprising thing for Bishop Hamilton to say, and I ought not to have overlooked that remark. I am very much encouraged, and I thank you for calling my attention to it, and I make my bow to Bishop Hamilton and my apology for having forgotten the fact that there was a concession, one only, that Bishop Hamilton was ready to make. So I do believe that now the last one of us has his face turned toward the future.

Bishop Hamilton: It is not necessary for Bishop Mouzon to apologize or beg pardon of me because accidentally the whole of that supposed slight of me slipped without my knowing that he was not doing me full justice. I have been Buckleyized for twelve years and it takes a great deal to cut me through the skin. I went right across the room at the close of the session and took Bishop Mouzon by the hand and told him that I never loved him more than now.

John F. Goucher: I do not know whether what I am going to say is in order or not. We have in both of our General Conferences a procedure for voting by orders. We have thirty bishops in the two branches of the Church and about thirty thousand ministers and sixty-six hundred thousand laymen. So far to-day we have had three episcopal addresses, three ministerial pronouncements, and the six million, six hundred thousand laymen have not been heard from. If it is in order, I would like to move that we now hear from some of the laymen.

H. H. White: I shall take pleasure in giving you my thoughts on this subject at this time. I regret very much that belated trains prevented my attendance earlier. I should have greatly enjoyed and profited by listening to the speeches which you have so highly eulogized that were delivered here this morning. I understand that great courtesy was accorded to me and Dr. Penn, we being the absent members of the two Commissions, in postponing the discussion of this great topic for a day. For

this I also express my appreciation. I do not know that the views which I shall express will meet the approbation of many who are present, and I am sure they will not deserve in any sense the high encomiums which have been placed on the episcopal addresses and what have been referred to as ministerial addresses by others to-day. However, I feel that perhaps the best thing I can do at this time is to lay before you gentlemen of the Commission my views on this, as I consider it, the greatest question which will come before this body. I do not desire to strike any note which will be out of harmony with almost everything else that has been said. I do not consider it necessary for every member of this Commission to proclaim his loyalty to the purposes which caused this Commission to meet, or his friendship and devotion to the brethren who are here. I shall simply say that the association which I have had at Baltimore and Traverse City and here with the members of the Commission on both sides has been very pleasant and sweet. I now ask your permission to do something I have never done before on any occasion that I can recall, and that is to read the remarks which I desire to make. I do this perhaps because of the danger of misinterpretation of the sentiment of the section from which I have come. The views expressed are my own views, but so far as my observation goes they represent and reflect very accurately the sentiment of a very large body of the M. E. Church, South. With your permission I shall now read:

THE NEGRO QUESTION AS RELATED TO THE PROPOSED UNION OF THE
METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCHES, NORTH AND SOUTH.

Brethren: Pretermittin any discussion as to the desirability or feasibility of union of our two great Churches, were all other causes for division removed or satisfactorily adjusted, I shall address myself to a short discussion of the proposition as related to what should be the proper status of the negro Methodists, either in or out of the proposed united Churches.

This question should be viewed from the standpoints of desirability and of feasibility, taking account both of ethical and of practical considerations.

The time and place are met when in Christian brotherhood frank statements should be made, and the exact status of both thought and feeling should be made known.

We raise no question here as to the relative superiority of races, nor as to whether such racial differences as exist are due to education or to nature; but, speaking from what the South believes in its heart of hearts to be true, both from the teachings of ethnology and from the instincts of six thousand years, the question must be considered to be one of race and not of caste, and one of the mass and not one of the individual.

Leaving argument to biologists, ethnologists, philosophers, and theologians, I shall state what I believe the South and the Southern Church will stand for, and will regard as a *sine qua non*. What I state may sound brutally frank, but it is stated in kindness and in brotherhood, in order that we may see each other "face to face" and not as "through a glass, darkly."

I believe that our position may be condensed into the following statement:

The South and our grand division of the Methodist Church believe:

(a) That the color line must be drawn firmly and unflinchingly, in State, Church, and society, without any deviation whatever; and no matter what the virtues, abilities, or accomplishments of individuals may be, there must be absolute separation of social relations. If the color line is disregarded in relations so intimate as those necessitated by the equal status theory, demanded, as I understand it, by the strongest negro members of the Methodist Church, North, it will be impossible long to continue the fixed status of separation in affairs governmental, civic, and social.

(b) We further believe that in this matter the South is but fighting the preliminary battle of the North, and is but now further advanced along the path which the North has already entered and will unfalteringly follow. At any rate, to use the language of another: "But he who supposes that the South will ever waver a hair's breadth from her position of uncompromising hostility to any and every form of social equality between the races, deceives himself only less than that other who mistakes her race instinct, the palladium of her future, for an ignorant prejudice and who fails to perceive that her resolution to maintain white racial supremacy within her borders is deepest rooted and most immutable precisely where her civic virtue, her intelligence, and her refinement are at their highest and best." Of course, that highest and best of civic virtue and intelligence and refinement is found in her Churches.

We further believe that the leaders of Southern thought and policy should keep step in Church and in State; and it is but well-known history to state that for forty years the South struggled, with an eagerness surpassing that of war, to throw off and to keep off the burden and the shadow of negro influence in political affairs; and only now are the labors of the men who led in that struggle being crowned with a moderate degree of success. It was only yesterday that constitutional provisions, such as the understanding clause in Mississippi and the grandfather clause in Louisiana, took the place of harsher and more dangerous means of correcting the evils turned loose upon the South by the adoption of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments.

But why has the South demanded and endured the storm and stress of reconstruction? We answer that it was to attain and maintain Caucasian supremacy, unadulterated and untainted in political and civic affairs.

But can the South, or what we fondly consider its leading Church, admit negroes on the plane of perfect equality in its religious councils and lawmaking or interpreting bodies, while it denies, or helps to deny, correlative rights and privileges in those so much less intimate relations of official and legislative life?

There is no use to blink the question: Until we are ready to admit that we and our fathers have perpetrated and assisted to perpetrate civil wrong in the reestablishment of purely Caucasian government in the South, we cannot permit the admission of any tincture into the pure Caucasian control of our ecclesiastical council and Conferences or courts.

But our Northern brethren now propose that there shall be only a modicum of negro representation in our Conferences; or that the negroes shall be set off into some special or Regional Conference where they will have a quasi territorial form of government.

Again, let us not blink the facts. All such propositions are subterfuges, to fool "the brother in black"—to amuse him with the shadow of equality while the substance is denied him. The grandfather clause of the Louisiana Constitution is a paragon of frankness and clarity, as com-

pared with such schemes. And nobody knows this better than the negro. Witness the prompt, energetic, and unanswerable reply of Dr. Jones to Dr. Blake's proposition that for the sake of harmony the negro surrender some portion of his present rights and privileges.

If I understand the position of the negro members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as voiced by their press and by Dr. Jones and Dr. Penn of this Commission, they claim as a vested right the full *pro rata* share for each member of power, influence, opportunity for advancement, office and property, with every other member—Caucasian, Mongol, or Malay.

Let us now view the question from another angle: The proposed union of the two Churches would take care of, say, about 300,000 or 350,000 negroes, and would leave practically out of consideration the remaining, say 1,500,000 or 2,000,000 negro Methodists, more or less, who are in other Churches, including our own negroes, the C. M. E. Church. No solution that considered only a small fraction of the tremendous host of negroes would be wise or acceptable. If I read the signs aright, the negroes who are in independent Churches are as determined to stay there as are those now in the Northern Church to stay there.

There is still another important fact to be considered—viz., the relations of the races wherever they exist in the same community in large numbers.

There is no doubt that the negro improves more by contact with and under the influence of the white race than by any independent amount of negro academic training or theological tuition. Therefore, some arrangement should be made which would provide for close relations between the white Church and the whole body of negro Methodists rather than a small segment, say 350,000 of them.

Just as the presence of the negro was obnoxious to Southern white men at the polls, just as he has been an irritant in Republican National Conventions, and just as he has been an element of uncertainty and weakness in the General Conference of the Northern Church, so will he unceasingly and in increasing ratio become a source of disquietude and danger in the Northern Church as his number increases.

Already the negro question is more a problem for the Northern than for the Southern Church.

But, say the negro leaders, there are but three ways to get out of the Church: to die out, to resign, or to be expelled. "But," they say, "the negro race is not dying out, but is increasing; we will not resign from the Church; we will do nothing to justify our expulsion." This is all true; still "men of light and leading" in the Northern Church can bring powerful moral pressure to bear on the negro mind by several arguments—among them these: That the negro race can, as a race, separate, though in kindly relations with the whites, work out a higher destiny than they can in the overwhelming numerical, intellectual, and moral superiority of the whites; the negro Methodists as a whole would have a far better opportunity for agglomerating into a great Church and working out a great destiny as an independent body than as individuals in a larger mass; the white Church, North and South, would act in greater sympathy with, and would contribute more materially to an independent negro Church than they now contribute; and there would be greater scope for individual leadership than there now is. This is only a brief outline of the many arguments.

I take the liberty of trying to draw some general conclusions from the foregoing statements, which, while they have been presented in the form of conclusions, could in my opinion be supported by sound argument. Among those conclusions are these:

1. That the Southern Church will not be willing to go into any ar-

rangement by virtue of which the colored delegates sit either in a General Conference or Supreme Court, and take part in their deliberations, on any basis whatever.

2. That the colored ministry and congregations of the Northern Methodist Church would resent very determinedly and even bitterly any proposition to assign them any sort of a minimum or modified representation in the General Conference. They are demanding, as I understand, full, absolute, and unqualified equality as members of the Church with all other members. This view on their part has been recently expressed very forcibly by Dr. Jones, who is on this committee which is meeting here, and who edits the leading *Advocate* for the colored Methodists in the Southwest, published at New Orleans.

3. The Southern Methodist Church would not feel justified in going into a union which would take care of, say, three hundred and fifty thousand colored members, now belonging to the Northern Church, but would not fully and adequately take care of or provide for the other, say, million and a half or two million negro Methodists belonging to other organizations, as the African Methodist, C. M. E., and others.

4. The only way in which a union of the Northern and Southern Churches can be brought about will be by the immediate or gradual elimination of the negro membership and in good faith attempt on the part of both Churches, North and South, to cause all negro Methodists to unite in one great body, which should be brought, in so far as may be, under the tutorship, and which would receive the encouragement of the white Church. Some of the negro leaders would probably object to this, but I am inclined to think that if they were assured:

(a) That the Northern Church would be forced to lessen its contribution to negro Churches, unless the negroes acceded to the view of the Northern Church;

(b) That if they did accede to that view and bring about the organization of a big negro Church, appropriations would be continued and increased—they could then be brought to adopt the white view. I do not mean by this to insinuate that these negroes are venal, but they are human beings, and I think that they could be brought to see that the negro race, under their leadership, fostered by the advice of a strong white Church, and supported by the liberality of such a Church, could better work out its destiny as a separate organization than it could as members of some other Church, always necessarily being in a subordinate position.

(c) If this cannot be done, I am inclined to think that we had better abandon all ideas of union as far as the home Church is concerned, consolidate such missionary and cognate enterprises as possible, especially in the foreign fields, and that the line of division, whether it be the Mason and Dixon's line projected, or some other, be rigidly adhered to. Let the Southern Church withdraw from the Northern territory, and turn over its congregations and Church property in the Northern territory to the Northern Church, and let the Northern Church do the same as to Southern territory, reserving to the Northern Church the right still to take care of, and for that matter increase, if it desires to do so, its colored membership.

I have thought over and studied these matters for something like thirty years, was a member of the Constitutional Convention of Louisiana which gave to the white people of the State the right to control the State, without the necessity of resort to force or fraud against the negroes. I am satisfied that the best men of the negro race really in their hearts look forward to and cherish the hope that some day what Professor Dubois refers to as the "veil which separates the white and the colored races" shall be removed.

I belong to the class of white men who believe that the relations of the

racesshould be governed, and are occasioned, by race differences rather than by matters of artificial caste. I champion negro education and the safeguarding of the rights of the negroes both as to property and person, but I have not been able to persuade myself that they ought to have been admitted into partnership in the political government of the country, or that it would be wise to give them such position in the Church as we feel we must withhold from them in the realm of politics.

R. E. Blackwell: I feel that we are discussing a subject that is the most momentous that has ever been discussed by any Church assembly on this continent. It is a question that concerns not merely the Northern and Southern Churches: the whole Christian world is looking at us to-day. When it was announced that I was on this Commission, I got letters from men of various denominations expressing the hope that we would show Protestantism how to get together. It is not a question, therefore, that concerns us alone. If we refuse to unite because of an almost negligible number of negroes in the General Conference, I believe it will go down in ecclesiastical history as "the great refusal." The most pathetic spectacle in history is the negro. He was brought here against his will. We Southern people have profited by him. I stand here as one who has profited by him. As far back as the records of two Virginia counties go, my ancestors were slave owners. I was helped in getting my education with money that was mine through my mother's slaves. I owe him a debt. I have not paid it. Many of my fellow Southerners have not paid the debt they owe the negro. We Southern Methodists were paying it at one time. I think we wanted to pay it. My heart beats with noble emotion when I think of what Bishop Capers did for the negroes. I think we are all proud of it. I am not proud of anything my Church has done for the negroes since they were set up for themselves. I do not think we intended to throw them off. We had to do what we did because our negroes were leaving us. In 1865 we had 208,000 of them; by 1870 they had become 80,000; in another quadrennium there might have been only 10,000. Our original plan of dealing with the negro was a good one. I wish it could have been kept up. It was more difficult socially than any plan that is proposed here, because white ministers had to serve negro congregations. This required sacrifices. We have not made such sacrifices since 1870. We have not run any risk of having our social relations with the negro criticized. I wish we could have kept up our original plan. What we do here is of interest not only to Protestant Christians, but to all students of racial questions. One of the greatest historians of Germany, Professor Lamprecht, of the University of Leipsic, was at my house a few years before he died. He had made his reputation by studying the development of the peasants of the Rhine valley. I knew that he was interested in the negro question, and I carried him over my county to show him the

various phases of negro life as seen in the old County of Hanover. At the end of the visit I said to him: "Have you any solution of the negro question?" "No," he replied; "but I will make this suggestion: Do not treat the negro so that the good negro will leave you and you will have only the bad negro remaining in the South." Then he added: "The great geographer of our University, Friedrich Ratzel, died some years ago. I visited him many times as he lay on his deathbed. Again and again he said to me: 'I cannot help thinking of the problem that the Southern States of America have on their hands. It is the greatest problem that any people ever had to solve.'" When we say, therefore, that we know how to solve the negro question, we do not talk convincingly. What is fifty years in the history of a race? What is fifty years in the history of a race situated as no other race has ever been situated in the history of the world? As no other people ever had such a problem, history does not help to solve it. We ought, therefore, to welcome all the experiments that can be made. Hence, I greatly regret that our old plan could not be continued; for we should then have had such an experiment as the Hampton plan in education, according to which the negroes are trained by white teachers, as well as the Tuskegee plan, according to which the negroes are trained altogether by negroes. The plan we drifted into causes us no qualms of conscience. We have hardly more concern about the negroes of the Colored M. E. Church than we have about Presbyterians or Episcopalians. Our people did not intend that it should be so, but it came as the result of putting the negroes off to themselves. But, as has been said here to-day, we are getting a new conscience on the subject of the negro. The young men who are to be leaders of the country are studying this problem at all Southern universities. Every State University in the South has a fund at its disposal to be expended on the study of this problem; and men of our own Methodist institutions have said to me that the relation between the negroes and the white people in the unified Church must be made closer than the relation that exists between us and the Colored M. E. Church. How is this to be done? The Church is not bringing the races closer together. The State is. The State has not done as the Church has, gone by on the other side, calling to the man who is down to get up and help himself and cultivate his race consciousness and not rely upon any Samaritan to help him up. The State is giving the negro education and is making the white people help to educate him. It is furnishing white inspectors for negro schools, it is furnishing white superintendents for their high schools, and it is instructing teachers how to teach. Under the appointment of the Governor of the State, I have to visit a negro school, go into the classroom, see the negroes teach, and

make suggestions to them. These teachers come to my house and discuss their problems with me. But I have never had to go into a negro Sunday school and help the teachers there. Our preachers do not go to hear negro preachers and make suggestions to them as I do to teachers in the school of which I am a trustee. The Samaritan State is helping the negro, and we must be very careful that the Church does not act the part of the priest and the Levite. Our Church must help the negro. We must stop letting the Northern Methodist come in as an outside Church and help the negroes in the South. They are our negroes, and I wish every cent of money that has been given them could have been given them by us and not by the North.

Bishop Atkins: We were not able to do it.

R. E. Blackwell: I know we were not, but I wish we could have done so. The Baptists are managing better than we Methodists. The Northern Baptist Church is not helping the negro as it once did, but is helping through the Southern Baptist Church—in coöperation with it. I do not want to perpetuate the present situation. I want the Methodist negroes in the South to be "our negroes," and to be helped by our Southern Methodists. From what I have told you the State is doing, I think it can be seen that we do not know even what the problem is in all its bearings. We talk of solving it when it is not yet in its most difficult stage. The State is making the negro independent. We know well enough how to treat the negro when he is dependent on us. But when he is not dependent on us, when he is educated by Northern money and often at Northern institutions, when there is educated leadership among the negroes, leadership by intellectuals who believe in cultivating race consciousness to its highest point, who advocate making no distinctions of any kind between white and black, who teach that the negro must fight and shed blood for his rights—then we shall have quite another problem. Can we not imagine a time when it will be the greatest help to us to have a body of negroes who, trained by us in our Church, getting counsel from our leaders on boards and in the General Conference, will feel that they are indebted to us for what they have and will prove a breakwater, a buffer between us and those intellectuals who work toward an end that no negro in the South should want and no white man either? I think, therefore, that we of the South might very well accept the plan that seems to be forced upon us as a result of the negro's being in the M. E. Church. We were practically forced to do what we did in 1870; I do not believe we thought independence best for the negro; a longer tutelage seemed better for him. Some of us, I think a majority of us, and some of the negroes, and I think a majority of them, think it is best for the negroes to be in a separate Church; but we have no choice in the matter

if we come together, as we had no choice in 1870. The negroes are in the M. E. Church, and they are just as much a part of the Church as any other members. Bishop Hamilton, who seems to speak for them, says that they would be satisfied with some sort of reduced representation. I should hate for them to feel that we had shoved them out. I fear that we should not prosper in our union, and that we should have the scorn of the religious world if it should get abroad that you and I had forced them out of the Church. On the other hand, if we accept the plan, what shall we have? The negroes would be in separate Churches, separate District Conferences, separate Annual Conferences, and once in four years they would have a small representation in the General Conference. Is there anything very alarming in that? Of course, we could present this matter to our people so as to alarm them. We could talk as if it were proposed to have the negroes make laws for white people, but nobody proposed that. The negroes will not make laws for the Church any more than will individual Conferences. No, I do not see that there would be any danger to our Church in having a few negroes in the General Conference. If we could only consider these negroes as our negroes, Southern negroes, we should have less difficulty; but they have been separated from us by Northern help and we unconsciously look upon them as Northern negroes. When we get together, they will become our negroes, helped by us, and the situation will be quite different. Then all our fear of negroes making laws for us and many other fears vanish as a bad dream. I wish to emphasize this thought: God is going to be with us after we reunite, and what we start with now will not continue forever if it is not best for us and for the negro. Growth implies a dropping off as much as a holding on; what seems good and attractive first may after a while drop away, just as blossoms that make the trees beautiful in spring disappear before the fruit shows itself. We Southern Methodists think our way of treating the negro the best way. We ought to remember how God led us into that. May he not in like manner be leading us into this other way so that the negro may be brought a little closer to us and we shall feel more responsibility for him? I am sure we could do him more good than you people of the North, because he is more nearly our neighbor than he is yours. This is, I have said, a great question, a question concerning not us alone but all Protestants. I should not like to try any method of solving it that would bring the Master's cause into contempt. I want to do what is best for the negro and best for us and what will help me and my Church to pay the debt we owe the Negro. May I tell you an incident that illustrates the relationship that I should like to have exist between the negro and my people and my Church? There used to visit across the street from my

home a refined and cultivated lady of most aristocratic bearing, in whose veins ran the blood of distinguished families of two commonwealths. She had a little boy, her pride and the envy of all young mothers. I have in my mind the picture of the little fellow as he springs up and down on his toes before his mother to develop his legs which she thought much too spindling. In course of time he went to West Point, and on graduating was sent West, where our army had grim work to do. In one of the battles with the Indians our troops were defeated, and as they retreated a negro trooper fell wounded by the fire of the Indians. All the rest of the men escaped, but when young Clarke saw the negro writhing in agony on the ground he went back through the zone of fire and brought him out. There were Northern men who could have done that; but this young Southerner risked his life and saved the negro. I have taken this sort of parable of what I should like for my Church to do for the negro.

The hymn, "My faith looks up to Thee," was here sung and Dr. Randall offered prayer.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Are there any others who wish to discuss the question?

H. N. Snyder: I do not think I have ever been in a meeting before where there were so many men accustomed to talk on slight provocation who have refused to accept great provocation. And, speaking for myself, I can understand why a great solemn silence holds almost every one of us back. In a little Southern city the other day a crowd stood on the sidewalk and watched ten thousand brown-clad soldiers go by, almost without a cheer. I turned to my neighbor next to me and I said: "Why don't you holler? Why don't you cheer?" We could not. We thought of that starry flag and of those boys and where they were going and what they were going to fight for and of those who could never come back. It was simply too big an hour for anybody to cheer. And it may be that now it is almost too big an hour for us to do anything more than pray in silence at this time. And yet we are bound to talk out the things on our minds. I have listened to my two friends, Dr. Blackwell and my old college friend, Judge White, and I do not find myself agreeing with either of them. I am wondering what has happened to them or what has happened to me. I wonder if the fact that one of them has lived his life mostly in Virginia and the other has lived all his in Louisiana, except the few years he associated with me at Vanderbilt, and I have lived most of my years in South Carolina, makes the difference between us. I think the differences, after all, may not be so great. The first suit of clothes I ever wore, trousers and jacket, was made out of a piece of gray cloth which they were saving for my father. I have never seen brass buttons as big as those were on that little jacket. I know they

seemed to me as big as a plate. They stood me on the dining table and I never understood why the family wept. I was having the time of my life in the new uniform. In my boyhood that followed the worst thing you could say about a man was to call him a Yankee; and if a boy would not fight under every other insult, if you tried that one, you got all that was coming immediately. Then there were the "Ku-Klux Klans" and the "Red Shirts." Stories of these and their achievements furnished the atmosphere in which we grew up and in which we passed from youth into manhood. Then by and by, as we began to think rather than to act from primitive impulses, there were those who said: "These methods of violence will not do. The things we want, the civilization which white men have built up and placed in the hands of other builders in order to keep it going—we must find other means than violence of continuing." Then we picked out such men as Judge White and sent them to Constitutional Conventions, and they found a quieter and more reasonable and probably even a legal way out. At any rate we were not satisfied with means of violence to get what we wanted. We went back in the Anglo-Saxon fashion to the only way we knew was the right way, the permanent and the legal way. That represented an advanced stage in the process of our thinking. We were saying to ourselves, If we can once settle this question of political relations, if we can once get back into our hands the control of the orderly processes of civic society, we shall be satisfied. Well, we got it. There is not a Southern State that has not all it wants plus in the control of the orderly processes of civic society. After we settled that question we began to take one more step, which I think was a step of progress. We said: Now we can go to work on something else. We can educate these black men. I have known men who got into positions of power in South Carolina and other States on this platform: "No money for negro schools, because you cannot hold them where you want to hold them if you educate them." I think that conception is passing fast out of the thoughts of thousands, because Southern white men will come to their better selves if you only give them time, and they are getting away from that older conception now. Dr. Blackwell spoke of what the States are doing in the direction of educating the negro. We have even gone so far away from the attitude of withholding what possibly was justly due him in the matter of his own taxes for his education that we are employing State inspectors for negro schools to see that he gets a just share of even taxes he does not pay and to see to it that, as far as possible, the money is spent in the most efficient way for his training. The point I am making in touching upon these particular matters is simply this: We are in each case adjusting ourselves to

meet conditions. I believe, therefore, that we have come right now to one of those new conditions, and we are going to face it as we faced the others. You can hear all over the South—in Louisiana too, I think—a good deal of the kind of talk you have heard from Dr. Blackwell. Are we doing all that we can or ought to do in the upbuilding of the best life of these people by whom we are surrounded? When a Southern man sees a man with a pocket full of transportation tickets toll away from him negroes who have lived in the cabins on his plantation for forty years, he is asking himself some questions while at the same time he may be making some unprintable remarks about the man who goes away on such a trip to Philadelphia or Pittsburgh. And so I believe that instead of crystallizing its thought on this question which has perplexed it so long, the South is ready now to take another sort of view of most of these matters from that it took, say, thirty years ago. I may not say that I have moved ahead of my friend Judge White, but that fine, frank paper of his read as if it were written yesterday instead of to-day. Certainly I do not think it has even implicitly in it the policy of to-morrow. He may be faithful to the essential things of his people, but I do not believe he is interpreting what his people are going to think and do in these next years in these matters. Now, there are two things that we all agree on with reference to the question we are discussing. The first is this: Nobody wants to draw any race line for the sake of drawing a race line. If we draw a race line, we must feel that in the act we are doing something which is for the benefit of both races at the time, and any discrimination in the drawing of this line can only be justified in this way. In the second place, there is not a man of us here who has not professed what we all know to be precisely the case, a deep sympathy—nay, more, a deep affection—for the negro. Now, Southern and Northern men, can we not capitalize that affection in a definite way? Do we think that things are going to stay just as they are, when the States are not only by their efforts lifting up the masses, but are creating individual leadership that is going to multiply itself more and more? When you lift the masses and multiply that leadership, the negroes are not going to stay just as they are; and we are going to have, I do not know how far in the future, a few more Constitutional Conventions if we want to hold things just as they are now.

H. H. White: May I ask you a question?

H. N. Snyder: Two of them.

H. H. White: Do you think the Constitutional Conventions will be able to settle it as the years progress?

H. N. Snyder: No, sir; and I have no faith, Judge White, in any Constitutional Convention, although I have every faith in

you, that undertakes to settle a question of human relations wholly by legal, constitutional means. And the point I want to make here is: a Church which ought to be a prophet of to-morrow—what is it doing for that morrow that is as sure to come as the fact that we are sitting here? You put negroes into a wholly separate and detached Church and you cut them apart from every possible influence that you can have. That is history. And unless somehow or other we can get hold of them and they get hold of us in such a way that, by extralegal means, we can put the sower of a sound morality and a sound spirituality into this relationship between the two races, then, I say, God save us in the South from the future that we face!

Edwin M. Randall: Mr. Chairman, it is very little I wish to say, but there are some considerations—

W. N. Ainsworth: With your permission, Dr. Randall, I would call attention to the fact that it is only seven or eight minutes until the time for adjournment. I would not like for you to be interfered with after you get under way.

John M. Moore: I was going to move that the time be extended until Dr. Randall finishes his address.

Edwin M. Randall: If it is desirable, you can adjourn and I will wait until morning.

C. M. Bishop: What do you prefer?

Edwin M. Randall: I shall be just as well satisfied to speak in the morning.

A. J. Lamar: I think it would be better to wait until morning and give Dr. Randall what time he wants. When a body of men get in the frame of mind in which we are now, it is apt to get on a man's nerves a little, and under such conditions a man is not in the very best condition to speak. I shall want to make a few feeble remarks myself, but I would not care to make them this afternoon.

C. M. Bishop: I move that we do now adjourn, and that in the morning Dr. Randall have the floor.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Dr. Ainsworth made various announcements.

Rolla V. Watt: With reference to the morning hour, I was late this morning. It was entirely unnecessary and simply through my own inadvertence. I know we can all get here at 9:30 without any trouble, but I had the idea that the time for meeting was 10 o'clock, because when we fixed the time of meeting that was the first time suggested.

Prayer was offered by Dr. Randall and the benediction was pronounced by Bishop Denny.

FOURTH DAY, SATURDAY, JANUARY 26, 1918.

The Joint Commission met in the Parish House of the Independent Presbyterian Church and was called to order by Bishop Cranston.

Mr. J. R. Pepper conducted the devotional exercises and read the twentieth Psalm. He also offered prayer.

The hymn, "Blessed Assurance," was sung, after which Mr. Kinne and Dr. Ainsworth offered prayer. The hymn, "How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord," was sung.

The minutes of the last session were read and approved.

A communication from Bishop Hoss was read.

The roll was called, and the following were present: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke, Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. A. Candler, W. B. Murrah, James Atkins. Ministers: Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. W. Van Cleve, J. J. Wallace, F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar. Laymen: G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, G. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, H. W. Rogers, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock, M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): At the time of adjournment yesterday we were discussing the general topic of the status of the negro and Dr. Randall had the floor.

Edwin M. Randall: I have been made aware of some kindly solicitude on the part of my friends in my behalf that I should open the discussion at this juncture in view of the responsibilities there may be in making the opening address at such a session as this, but I assure you that when I rose to take the floor last evening, and in taking the floor this morning, nothing is farther from my thoughts than attempting any rhetorical effects. I feel the depression of the great responsibility that rests upon us weighing so heavily and so seriously upon my heart that it would seem to me that the thought of any such thing would be sacrilegious in this place. There is what seems to me to be an important aspect in this matter that has not yet been brought to the attention of the body. I do not need to assure any one in this presence of the seriousness with which I consider this matter. My brethren, I believe now that I love my Church better than I love my life. My travel and residence in the South have revealed to me a people residing there that I know I can love as

dearly and trust as fully as those with whom I have been more intimately associated, and I do not need to assure Dr. Penn, who for eight years associated with me in the Epworth League, or Dr. Jones of my interest in and love for their race. It is with some misgivings that I approach this subject. If my travel and residence have been of some advantage to me, it is not equal to that of the brethren who have been born and reared under these problems; and yet, while not comparing myself with those men, I remember the surprise that came to us Americans some years ago at the significance there was in the common, everyday affairs of life about us that did not occupy our thoughts and to which we gave no special interpretation when they were reviewed by a kindly critic among us in Bryce's "American Commonwealth." So I am aware that the visitor may sometimes see things that escape attention by their very familiarity. What impresses me, brethren, is that the question before us is not primarily a compromise between the M. E. Church and the M. E. Church, South. It is not our business here primarily to find a middle or common ground that is acceptable to us. We are facing one of the greatest sociological problems of the ages and one that is being forced upon us to-day and that in the future will be a far greater problem than it is in the present, and that question is, How can two races with great dissimilarities dwell together in harmony and friendly coöperation and helpfulness? There resides within us naturally a race consciousness that leads us to be very unjust to one another. We despise the immigrants of our own race and color who come among us with a strange tongue. We speak of the Italian contemptuously as a Dago; but what race is there in all the world, what people is there among all the peoples of the world where genius breaks forth more frequently than among the Italians? All we need to do is to acquaint ourselves more perfectly with our fellows of other races and other languages to find among each a history and a record that justify great pride in their ancestry and great confidence in their race; and we need to find the leaven that will so work upon the hearts of men that they will generously recognize the capabilities and worth in one another until in all kindness and charity they will work together with love and forbearance. When that can be done there will be no more war or strife in the earth; until that is accomplished, treaties and international arrangements and agreements of every sort are but precarious guaranties for the time being. Now, the solution of that sociological problem is before us and depends more upon us and those we represent for its solution than upon anybody else in the world. We have a difficult situation before us, an advanced and masterful race in contact with an unadvanced race with but a

humble history. And yet, while it has but a humble history, it has a record for individual achievements and individual heroism and individual sacrifice that justifies a very large degree of confidence and hope among the men of that race and upon our part as well. I believe that the only solution of this problem is to be found in the literal application of the spirit and the law of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and in that living helpful relation to one another that has been enjoined in his words. In this I recognize that the responsibility is primarily with the stronger race. It is for us from our advantage of position to exercise the self-restraint upon ourselves and to extend the helpfulness in behalf of the less fortunate, that shall enable us to establish that relationship between us that will bring the solution for which we hope. Moreover, the welfare of both races is involved. We each make an environment for the other and the moral condition of the other race reacts upon ourselves. No white family can live surrounded by a colored people without feeling the effect of that environment. Certainly, the colored people feel tremendously the effect of the environment they have among the white people. I believe it to be a fundamental principle that God has established, and under the influence and power of which we must live, that no one can take advantage of another, no race can take advantage of another without the individual of the race that takes that advantage suffering a severe penalty for having taken that advantage. It is my judgment—I give it as my judgment to-day—that our Southland is suffering the most severely of any section of our land, and that it has before it the most serious menace of any section of our land growing out of the presence in the South of a race that, because of its misfortunes and the limitations that have been upon it and that are upon it at the present, is held and treated in a measure at least as an inferior or subject race. I think I will be understood in this. I also wish to express as my judgment that the evils of race friction have reached but a very small degree of their possibility for evil. Furthermore, problems that have been chiefly Southern are to be nation-wide and concern us all; and we are as much interested for our own race to find a solution as we are for this race that is the subject of our consideration. Again it was suggested yesterday, in one of the addresses, that possibly there had come a time when it was best for us to introduce a change of method. This accords with some reflections of mine. The increased education, the broader vision, the higher ambitions that are being entertained by the negro race as the result of their advancement demand some recognition and consideration. There is no question whatever but that there is a condition of restlessness and discontent among them. Some years ago at a little sta-

tion in the south one cold, chilly winter night when, because of the delay of a train on the main line, it was necessary to remain unexpectedly about a railroad station, two very eminent men of the colored race were excluded from the privileges of a fire with which to warm themselves simply because they were colored. The agent in charge of the station explained to Dr. McFarland and myself that we did not understand the way in which those people were held down there. Because of the delay of the train there would be a failure to make connections at the next place to which we were going and those colored men desired, as there was no suitable hotel where they could be entertained, to get word to their friends that there might be a home open for their entertainment, and they were denied the privilege of sending a telegram. I know that thing is not approved of by any member present. I know it is profoundly disapproved of by the best men of the South, and yet I am aware that this is illustrative of a situation not uncommon in the experience of these men.

W. N. Ainsworth: May I ask the Doctor a question?

Edwin M. Randall: Certainly

W. N. Ainsworth: Did I understand you to say that these men were denied the privilege of sending a telegram?

Edwin M. Randall: I did say that.

H. H. White: Where was that?

Edwin M. Randall: At Chehaw.

H. H. White: Where is that?

Edwin M. Randall: That is a little station where a branch line leaves the main line for Tuskegee.

W. N. Ainsworth: If they had asserted their rights, they would have had them. I never heard of such a proceeding before.

Edwin M. Randall: One of them is here.

Irving G. Penn: I was one of the men and I did assert my rights. The agent would not accord them to us. I reported the circumstances to the West Point people and they discharged the agent.

H. M. Du Bose: Was there not an equal provision in that depot for the colored as well as the white passengers? It was most extraordinary if there was not.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Please do not take up the time of the Commission on what we know was a purely local affair due to the disposition of that particular agent.

Edwin M. Randall: I was trying to make that clear. If I had been allowed to proceed with my statement uninterrupted, all these questions would have been unnecessary. The man was discharged and the incident was a matter that was simply due to that individual. I was proceeding to make it clear that I knew no

such thing was approved of by any member present, and no such thing would be approved by any man among the better men of the entire South. I want to say that among the better people of the South the negro has more helpful and more sympathetic friends than he has in any other part of this land. That is my conviction individually. I desire in the utmost kindness and love, and in the same spirit in which my dear brother Judge White spoke yesterday and said things plainly that made me love him more, as widely as he differed from me in some of his views—I desire to illustrate that there are experiences among the leaders, and the same is true among the rank and file of the race, that ought to be removed, and that existing are creative of discontent. I wish to add that these things are not confined to the South, that in the North the colored man meets with discrimination and with mistreatment and with prejudice that sometimes is more bitter than may often be found in the South. It is a situation, a condition, beloved, that is nation-wide, and under these conditions no race can come to its best. The relations between us as races under these conditions cannot be as helpful upon the one hand nor as beneficial upon the other as they must be. Now, passing over for the sake of brevity some other matters which I had in mind to say but which are not essential, I have been impressed that we, both of us, have been not without error in the past. I have heard brethren say in this presence that their Church had not accomplished all they desired; I am free to acknowledge that in our work in the Southland there have been some errors upon our part. I am impressed further that at this time it is our duty, if possible, to discover not merely a compromise between the attitude that your Church may have had or may have at the present time and the attitude that my Church may have had or may have at the present time; but it is our duty to try to discover, if possible, a way by which we may enter rightly a future of marvelous promise and possibilities and meet the conditions that are before us in that future. These conditions, so far as the negro is concerned, are to be characterized by better education and training than he has had before, by opportunities to help himself in educational institutions that will offer larger privileges than before, opportunities that grow largely out of increased provision made in his behalf by your Southern States and Southern philanthropy. The opportunities before us not only involve questions as to the negro, but as to the salvation of the whole world and as to the relations of the nations of the earth. It is our business to find a way by which, uniting the personnel and the prayers and the faith and the consecration and the labor and the resources of all Methodism, we may plan the largest things and attain to the very highest achievements. If

we discover such a plan, I am ready to go into our Churches as an advocate and a missionary to endeavor to secure the adoption of such a plan if it should seem that our Church was not ready for the adoption of it. And furthermore, beloved, I believe we are to-day in the presence of a great peril. We white men are planning from our perspective and from our perspective only. In all kindness and conscientiousness we are determining what we believe will be the very best for the negro, and I have not the remotest question of the absolute kindness and conscientiousness of each one of us in formulating what he believes will be the very best for the negro. But none of us can ever enter with full sympathy and understanding into the other man's perspective, and the issue does not rest so much upon what we may determine from our perspective as how it may appear to him from his perspective. A man with all kindness and benevolence may bestow upon an ill-clad individual a suit of clothes, but it rests upon the recipient whether he will wear that suit of clothes. I may extend a place in my home to some one homeless and needy, but it rests with him whether he will accept that hospitality. There may be, even unconsciously to me, something in the manner in which I extend the invitation or make the offer that renders it unacceptable to him. We have had some employers in the North, without question high-minded, generous men, anxious to contribute something to the solution of the labor problem, make generous provisions for their employees that impressed the world as being very liberal; and yet we have seen those same employees to whom the benefaction was made rise in a strike and refuse to be beneficiaries of their liberality. The employees have said, "We do not want this as charity. If we earn it, we want it in our salaries or to receive it as wages," and there has been something in the manhood of their attitude that has appealed to us and we have respected them. The question is not in the value of the thing we offer, but all hangs on the manner in which it is viewed by those to whom we offer it—whether it has in it the recognition of independence and the fairness and the Christian spirit that will enable them to receive it and enjoy it as we desire. If we make an unacceptable offer to these brethren of the colored race, and after we have made this provision for them they shall feel that the provision has in it any element that so limits their opportunities as a race or so compromises their self-respect in living under it that they cannot afford to live under those conditions and remain in the Church on our terms, so that after we have made this provision they will reject it and withdraw from us, that would mean, beloved, that the last effectual contact between the great, strong Methodism of America and the colored race among us has been severed and lost. To my mind, that involves

not only the loss of a great opportunity with the colored race here in America, but it would also involve our standing and repute before the world. It would involve the success of our entire missionary future. Not that it would all be sacrificed, but it would be imperiled. It seems to me we must proceed prayerfully for the purpose of finding a solution to this great sociological problem whereby we may prove to the world that it is possible for two races that are divergent in many characteristics and that at the present moment are markedly different in their condition, one far more favorably situated than the other—that it is possible for two such races to dwell together in Christian love and sympathy and mutual helpfulness and, without any question relative to superiority or inferiority, but in mutual helpfulness and sympathy working out the very best that God has placed in each of them and letting the future under God and without any question on our part determine the individual and racial merit. That is not our business. That is a matter between us and God. It is of no credit or honor to me that I surpass another in any endowment that I brought into the world when I was born. The only responsibility I have to my Heavenly Father is to take the endowments I have and to so live and use them under God that I shall come to the best that is in me in character and helpfulness and in service to my Heavenly Father and to my fellow men. That being done, I have come up to the full measure of what is possible for any one to do. Without raising these questions, can we not so love and labor together? I believe that principle is the solution of our own problem here and the problem of all race contact throughout the world that must become increasingly intimate with the progress of the civilization that is bearing us irresistibly forward upon its tide. Personally, I do not believe that either project that is submitted to us meets fully this condition; but I do believe that, with modifications, the preferential proposition can be made most readily to meet the demands of the situation before us. I thank you, brethren.

Charles A. Pollock: It has not been my pleasure and profit to attend any of the former meetings of this body. I have not heard your discussions until this session and, owing to one of your Illinois or Tennessee or Alabama or Georgia blizzards with which this country is so afflicted, I was twenty-four hours late. If my good brother yonder, Dr. Du Bose, was put into such a state of exhilaration by having passed through one North Dakota blizzard, what do you think of me when I have had to go through thirty-seven of them?

Bishop McDowell: You have got in the habit of being in them.

Bishop Cranston: I should say that you were certainly ready for a cool judgment on a warm subject.

Charles A. Pollock: In court when we put a witness on the stand we always ask him a few questions to show his competency to speak or to give testimony. Among other things, "Where do you live?" and if it is not a lady we always inquire, "How old are you?" We find out his business and as much as we can of the character of the witness about to testify. I will give a little testimony of myself, if you will pardon me. My brethren of the North know all about me; my brethren of the South perhaps do not. I was born in Essex County, N. Y., fourteen miles from where John Brown was born and where his remains now lie. My parents were what were known as abolitionists. I was reared in the State of Iowa, going there in the year 1856, not an old child. For thirty-seven years I have lived in the territory of North Dakota, always in that part now known as the State of North Dakota. My ancestors from away back were soldiers of the United States and some of my kin sleep in Southern soil. With all these conditions surrounding me you will perhaps be able to judge somewhat of the trend of my thoughts. I have heard used here the word "compromise." When a boy in school I heard and read of that great compromiser, Henry Clay.

E. C. Reeves: I was named for him.

Charles A. Pollock: I am glad to hear that. Whenever that word is used I always think that we must consider its origin a little or else become involved in our thinking. If there is anything wrong in compromising, we ought to go home, because I take it that this body is not here to do wrong; but if there is a proper use of the word, then it seems to me we should remain until the word shall receive its fullness of meaning. I have been interested somewhat in the great temperance movement which has swept over this land. I have wondered why it was that good men believing in the same principles with reference to total abstinence and prohibition could not get together always upon the same platform; but they do not. There are some to-day who absolutely refuse to think of the word "compromise" because forsooth they believe that they are committing a great wrong. If my good friend Judge Reeves or any other man on this floor believes in his heart that he is going wrong in making a compromise, it does not become me to ask him or you to compromise, because if I have the right to ask you to wrongly compromise you equally have the right to ask me to do the same thing, which I cannot do. Now, let us see whether we can find a basis for compromise—a proper compromise. And before we do that, let us understand what the word means. We lawyers always like to go to Blackstone. I suppose there were more Blackstones sold in this country before and during the

colonial period than there were in England, and we are told that that book had a great influence upon the people of that period. If you open that book, you will find that the author divides his subjects under the words "Rights" and "Remedies." Rights refer to things that are fundamental; remedies refer to those means by which we secure our fundamental rights. I have wondered whether by the use of those words we could not discover some way out of our dilemma. Going back to the temperance movement for a moment, allow me to stand up before you one hundred men who are believers in total abstinence and also in our disciplinary statement that the "liquor traffic" cannot be licensed "without sin." If you ask these one hundred men to vote upon the question whether they agree to that statement, every one of them would vote yes. And why? Because, if you please, the principles therein announced are fundamental. But when you inquire how you would bring in prohibition, whether first nationally or through the lowest division of the State, or by county option, then the people begin to divide. And why? In view of the fact that you are there dealing wholly with remedies. When we are talking about local option, some people rise and say, "I cannot accept that. My conscience will not permit me so to do. It would be wrong for me to be in favor of local option." Those people are confused in their thoughts. They are putting their consciences into the remedy and are not thinking of fundamental rights. Why, my friends, I can stand in one place in the State of North Dakota and I would be absolutely opposed to local option, and I can walk one hundred feet across the Red River into the State of Minnesota and be in favor of local option. And why? Have I changed? Not in the least. With us we have adopted the larger unit of operation—the State—and, of course, being opposed to saloons, I am opposed to any means of bringing in the saloons. But over in Minnesota they have not adopted State-wide prohibition, the larger unit, and the only way in which they are turning out the saloons, as they have been in the past, is by proceedings through local option methods. So I say, my friends, let us not get lost in our use of words. Now, if what I have said means anything, it means this: that when we of the North ask you gentlemen to compromise, we do not ask you to compromise on a fundamental principle, because we know you cannot do that. Neither do we want you to ask us to compromise on a fundamental principle, because we cannot. But when you are dealing with great remedies for the amelioration of the race, when you are dealing with a great problem of numbers, you are stepping over into purely administrative concerns and we are ready to compromise; we are ready to meet you more than halfway, if such be required. When I came to the Southland I came as a

student. Unfortunately, I have not had the opportunity of meeting as many Southern men as I would like to have met. I have met you for the past twenty years in the National Anti-Saloon League. I have talked with you upon the great questions involved in the destruction of the liquor traffic. Our hearts have beat as one on that proposition. About three or four years ago my good brother Du Bose and I sat together at Atlantic City talking upon the subject of bringing the Churches together and we wondered why it was not possible for them to unite just as well as the people in the Anti-Saloon League. When I came here I did not know the exact mind of the Southern people as to the negro as a man. Is he a human being? Has he a soul? Do you expect to meet him in heaven? I notice you call him "brother." I was confused in my knowledge of your situation. I did not know exactly what you meant by the use of your terms. But you remember what the good brother, Bishop Mouzon, who spoke yesterday, said. He said in substance that the races must live together, work together, die together, and go to heaven together. That answers all my questions as to your fundamental relations to the colored man. Then, if you please, Mr. Chairman, I start with that as the basis of what I have to say, that we agree upon the fundamental question of the character of the humanity, if you please, not only of the colored man, but the men of all races and all colors with whom we shall have to deal. And right here, may I digress a moment? I cannot see my way clear through this great question and settle it upon the status of the negro alone. I expect to see a great Methodism of the world and I hope some such name as that will be applied to our new Church. I hope to see the United Methodist Episcopal Church contain ten million souls before I die. And so, in dealing with this matter now, we are necessarily dealing with a great question which projects itself years and years into the future. I think we make a mistake in feeling that here and now we are legislating—we are preparing a constitution—we are laying the foundation for a superstructure that will be completed within a few years. Such is not the fact. It will be impossible for us to determine the status of the negro without at the same time determining the status of all the other people with whom we expect to deal. There is a border line between rights and remedies. Sometimes when we get upon that line we become confused. Take the question of the social relations of the negro and I will speak of him now just as one of the classes. I believe that it is a fundamental principle with you good people of the South that there cannot be social contact between the two races. But let me tell you, sirs, if I rightly interpret the spirit of the North, they are just as strong in their conviction upon that question as you are. The

people of the North do not expect—they do not want nor will they permit social contact. I am speaking for myself, and I am speaking for those of the North with whom I am acquainted. I would expect you people of the South to come into social relations with the negro before the people of the North. So that upon that fundamental question, if it is fundamental, and it is, we are agreed and it can be put aside. We are not asking you to compromise on that. But some day my good friend Judge Reeves will meet his old mammy in heaven—

E. C. Reeves: I hope to.

Charles A. Pollock: And his old mammy will say, "Judge, what did you do for my people before you left and came up here?"

E. C. Reeves: And I will say, "I helped set them up in an independent Church where they could grow and grow and grow."

Charles A. Pollock: I am glad Judge Reeves answered the question, because it helps in what I have to say. That shows that we are dealing with the remedy. "Helped set them up in an independent Church!" That is only the remedy by which he hopes to get as many of the colored brethren into heaven as he can. Now, I shall weary you with but a few more remarks. I simply want to throw out these words which have come to me practically at the moment because of the use of this word "compromise." I want to say to this body that I was wonderfully pleased when I came to talk with our brethren of the North to find that while we have twenty-five men on the Commission every man must vote his individual convictions, unhampered by any strings from the majority of his associates. We are speaking here independently—I am speaking independently—I do not know whether my brethren agree with me or will agree with me in all I have to say; but I do want to say that my Church—the Church in which I was born and from which I hope to go to heaven—is in favor of a united Methodism. I want to say to you further that I do not want to go home to my people and say that I have left one stone unturned, but rather have done everything I could to bring this great Church together. That is the way I feel. I look at these various reports presented for consideration. There are administrative questions found therein upon which I am not ready to speak or vote at this time, but the basic principle of union involved is there. We do not need to compromise upon that basic principle. We believe that there must be some unity on earth between these men who expect in the future to be together in heaven. In matters of administration, in matters of representation, in matters dealing with those things which are not fundamental, there can be compromises in such fashion that you people can be properly satisfied and so can we. I think it was Henry W. Grady, from Atlanta, who

went North and made an address some years ago. He brought a vision to the North of the spirit of the New South. And when I heard these gentlemen from the South upon the floor yesterday afternoon speak in the spirit of Henry W. Grady, then I said to myself, "I can join hands with those men here and hereafter, because I believe if they represent the Church for which they speak then certainly we can join hands in a holy union." Gentlemen, I cannot take my seat without expressing to one and all of you my deep appreciation of your very courteous treatment of me the other day when I came. I hope, yes, more than that, I pray my Master that He who died for us all, He who is an intercessor at the great white throne, may be among us as we further proceed.

Henry Wade Rogers: Let me say first that I sat here yesterday afternoon and was thrilled by the words that were spoken. They sounded in my ears like the sweet music of some cathedral bell and I was thrilled by what was said. Those words were fragrant of righteousness, of justice, of humanity, and of brotherhood. The men who spoke them showed a nobility that moved my soul. They showed themselves to be men of vision living in the present and with faces turned toward the future rather than the past. May I say to the Commissioners from the Church, South, that if you will meet us halfway we will meet you, and that there is no man on our Commission who, if he were disposed to do so—and I know of none who is—could defeat the reunion of our Churches? May I say another word? I have lived many years. I have filled some positions of trust and responsibility. I now occupy, as you know, a position to which I have been appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate, and which imposes upon me a heavy responsibility. I sit in a court of last resort which disposes finally of more than ninety-five per cent of the cases which come before it in a circuit of the United States which is as important as any in this country. I feel the nature of that responsibility. Just a few days ago we disposed of a case which involved \$38,000,000. Not long before that we had before us a case which involved the question whether a great transatlantic company which was doing a business of nearly \$60,000,000 a year should be permitted to go on or whether it should stop. That is a sacred responsibility; but I say to you, brethren, I feel in this Commission that a responsibility of another sort and just as sacred rests upon me and rests upon you. I left my responsibilities at home to come down here to discharge the responsibilities which are upon me to my Church. I have not said much in this Commission up to this time. You will bear me witness as to that. I have not been much interested, to tell you truly,

as to whether our bishops are to be elected by a General Conference or by Regional Conferences. That question does not trouble me. I have not been much interested as to whether our Church shall have a Supreme Court or whether it shall not. I have not been much concerned over the questions as to what shall be the qualifications of the men that may sit in it or how long they shall occupy their offices. Those questions do not trouble me—I do not care. But I am very much concerned in the question that is now before us. It is the crux of the whole business. It makes a difference to me whether our Church is to be a united Church or whether it is to be a divided Church. We divided nearly seventy-five years ago and are divided still. The war for the Union ended fifty-two or fifty-three years ago, and years ago we became a united country. Why is it then that we remain a divided Church? I went down to Washington about two weeks ago, and a young fellow who sat next to me in the Pullman dining car had on the uniform of the United States Army. He was a splendid looking fellow. The bar on his shoulders told me that he was a lieutenant in the regular army. He said to me that he had graduated from Stevens Institute, an engineering school, and had been to Plattsburg in the training camp for the officers of the army, and was on his way to Savannah, where his father and mother lived, to bid them good-by, as in a few days he was going across the sea to “Somewhere in France.” I spoke to him of my wife’s nephew who had been in the training camp at Fort Myer and that the government had sent him to Camp Lee, at Petersburg in Virginia, where he would be kept some months in training other men to become soldiers. And this young fellow said to me: “That would not suit me. I want to get over to the other side and into the scrimmage and into the battles, and the sooner I get there the better pleased I shall be.” There are thousands of men from the Southland who are on the other side with that spirit in their bosoms. There are thousands more going there from the South who are loyal to the flag of our long-ago united country, and made a united country by such men as Colquitt and Ben Hill and Norwood and Lamar and the present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Now, I wonder what reason there is that after seventy-five years of division we cannot heal that division. We have healed our political division; why can we not heal our religious division? I want to say to my fellow Commissioners from both Churches that we have been sent here to unite these divided Churches. If our General Conferences did not mean that, why did they send us here? They meant it should be done, it ought to be done; and if we do not do it, we cast discredit upon both Churches before the nation. We also

discredit ourselves and write our names in our ecclesiastical history as incompetent to discharge the very simple and plain duty which the Churches laid upon us when they appointed us to do this thing. I happen to be one of the two men from the Northern Commission who met two men from the Southern Commission in Washington and drafted this preferential report. The members of that subcommittee from the Church, North, and the members of that subcommittee from the Church, South, who framed that report did not have any difficulty in getting together. We do not ask you to accept our report without such modifications as your wisdom suggests; but if you do not accept it, we do ask you to find some other common platform upon which these two Churches can unite. Something was said yesterday by our good brother from Louisiana which seemed to me to be a total misconception of what is before these Commissions. There is no question here about social equality. There is no question here about political equality. There is no question here about industrial equality of the races. If a physician finds his way into the lowly cabin of some poor colored man to minister to his physical needs and save his life, there is no question involved of social equality when he goes into the cabin. If a lawyer appears in court to defend the rights of a colored man, there is no question of social equality involved in what he does. And if a teacher goes into a colored school to inspect the work that is being done there, as Dr. Blackwell told us yesterday he was doing in Virginia, there is no question of social equality involved in that fine conduct. Does any one suppose that the teachers of New York City who go down to the schools on what is known as the East Side to teach the girls and boys of the slums are placing themselves upon a plane of social equality with the children they teach? Does any sane-minded man suppose that a servant of Jesus Christ who administers the sacrament to a colored man or who shows him the way to a better life is putting himself upon a plane of social equality with that man? Nothing of the sort. We are not here to decide whether we shall have mixed Churches composed of whites and blacks. No one proposes it, and that is not the question here. We shall still have our separate Churches for whites and blacks. We are not deciding whether there shall be colored bishops who shall preside in white Conferences or whether there shall be colored ministers preaching to white congregations. No one proposes it, and that is not the question. We are to decide simply whether we can frame a system of government which will allow these colored congregations to do about as they have been doing. Why do you ask us—I don't believe a majority of you do—why do you ask us to say that no colored

man under any circumstances shall sit in the General Conference of our Church? If you ask us to take that position, you are asking us to go further than any Catholic or any Protestant Church in this country has gone. In the Presbyterian General Assembly which met the other day in Texas there sat thirty-six colored men. The Episcopal Church in Arkansas has elected a colored bishop. The Catholic Church is reaching out for the colored people. Are we Methodists to affront Christianity? Are we to shut our eyes to the trend toward democracy by saying that our reunited Methodist Church cannot have in it a single man of color? I do not believe you will propose any such proposition. Now, I am going to say to you what I said to the representatives on that subcommittee from your Commission at Washington. I said to them: "We have met here to devise a plan by which these Churches can be reunited. Don't ask us to agree to a General Conference that shall have no colored man in it. Don't ask us to agree to a report that shall say that there must be separate General Conferences for the colored Churches, for I do not believe our Commissioners will accept it." They said: "A separate General Conference for the colored men would be our choice and would be our preference; but if we cannot have that, we will agree to this preferential report." Brethren of the Commission from the South, will you not meet us in that same spirit? We are not asking for a General Conference with a large representation of colored men, but we are asking you to agree that we shall have for our United Church a General Conference in which all—Americans, Chinese, Asiatics, South Americans, and Mexicans—may sit and legislate with us. It was said by one of the Southern Commissioners that you may have in your Church some Bleases and some Vardamans. I don't know whether you have or not; but if you have, I predict that their influence in the Church will not long count, if it counts no more than the influence of Blease or Vardaman counts in the Senate of the United States. That is my prediction. Meet us, brethren, in the spirit in which we meet you. If anything has been said on this side that ought not to have been said, if I have said anything that I ought not to have said, forgive me. We love you and love your Church, and we want the division of 1844 healed and want it healed before we leave Savannah.

Robert E. Jones: When I spoke to you at Baltimore I uttered the conviction that as one man I would do everything I could for the consummation of the union of these two great Churches. I am of that opinion to-day, but I speak this morning with just a little misgiving and some personal embarrassment. I do not like to be the occasion of all this.

E. C. Reeves: You cannot help it.

Robert E. Jones: If anybody knows my intense feeling, if he knows something of my inner life, if he knows something of the policy of aloofness I have pursued, he will understand that personally I would rather be elsewhere. I am in favor of the union of these two Churches. I am absolutely sure it ought to come. Dr. Bishop, I am sure that it will come. I do not know that I say with others that it ought to come to-day; God grant it may. I do not believe that if it does not come to-day it is not coming. I do not believe that you can stop it. I do not believe we ought to take that position at all. I think as Commissioners we are here as custodians of an idea, that it is not necessarily our task to frame a plan that will pass. I rather think it is our task to frame a plan that will meet our own judgment and that will be a working ideal for the Church. But be that as it may, that is absolutely on the side. I had a great experience yesterday. As a negro, yesterday was a revelation to me and a real joy. I enjoyed Judge White's speech, really I did. There is no camouflage in that at all. I did not agree with all he said—of course, I did not—but I enjoyed the speech. I enjoyed its frankness. I think when men can come together in the beautiful spirit in which we talked yesterday there is hope for the future. I have no feeling against Judge White and you, Judge Reeves. I believe I could fall in love with you before sundown. One of the finest letters I received on my report after the last meeting was from Judge Reeves, who is a type of the real Southerner. I do not fear him one bit. I understand you, Judge, and you understand me, and there is something about your humor and directness that I honestly like. Now, just a word or two before I get off. Bishop Mouzon said that he was afraid the races were growing apart. Bishop, that is the tragedy of the whole thing. You further said that you were afraid that the negro had a suspicion and that we did not quite trust you in every way. One of the saddest things in the life of the American Church in the last twenty-five years is the fact that at the session of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ held in St. Louis, a Commission on the Negro which was composed of white men and negroes unanimously brought in a resolution to the effect that the negro did not have full faith in the white man's religion. I am on the Commission, but I was not there. I did not have any hand in it. But that is an actual fact. The races have been growing apart. It is not my fault. God knows that for twenty-one years in New Orleans I have been doing everything that I knew how to do that there might be peace and good will. I have preached to my people over and over again that it made no difference what

a man should do to me or what a race of men should do to me, I should hate no man. God is my judge that I have pursued that in my private life and in my daily life. And how sad I was when the whole question of migration came up and 600,000 of my people moved into the North, some too soon, some who knew not where they were going. An old negro woman went to an agent of one of the railroad companies and laid down \$25 and said, "I want a ticket." "Where to?" asked the ticket agent. She said, "That is none of your white folks' business. Give me a ticket; I want to go." Bishop Murrah and Judge White, there you had no point of contact with those negroes. The industrial South needed them, but no one could stop them. We could not handle them, and so I say the tragedy of it. You want me to speak frankly and in love, and I do; and I pray God for forgiveness if I say by implication or otherwise a single word that would mar the meeting. The sad thing is that in the negro churches, among the rank and file, the negroes do not believe in the Christianity which you live toward them. Something has been said about race consciousness. That is not what you want, brothers. Do you know what race consciousness is? It is human consciousness acute. It is human consciousness resenting discrimination. It is a drawing up. It is becoming self-content and at the same time resenting what you may feel, that others are treating you as something separate and apart. Someone said something about social equality. May I speak to you squarely in the open? My mother is seven-eighths white. I sometimes say that I have good blood, all of it is first-class blood. I could tell a great story, but that is not my mission here. (I had better tell you that I had a daddy and that he was a colored man.) When Fred Douglass married a white woman I remember how my mother recoiled and resented it, and Fred Douglass almost lost his influence among the colored people of the South because of that. Just the other day we paid the mortgage off his home, which we wanted as a sort of Mecca; but Fred Douglass in his day and generation almost lost caste because of his marriage to a white woman. Do you think we want social equality? If you do, I will underwrite a contract with you and I will split my veins and sign it in my own blood and we will build a wall so high that no negro can get over it, and so thick that no white man can go through it. I was down in Georgia the other night soon after Dr. Steel had made that statement in the *New Orleans Advocate* about the intermixture of the races, and I said to them that we should drive from our midst any negro woman who sells her virtue to a white man and that sort of thing should cease. I put it with a sort of emphasis, and for five minutes I could not go on with my speech.

The people jumped over the benches, and one man who was a cripple left his crutches and picked me up and carried me about on the platform. You don't understand us, brothers. We have our own social life. When I married, I married a woman of darker skin than my own. I said before God that my children should know who they were. I am not responsible for what I am. You cannot blame me. I have always pursued that same policy; and if there is any man here to-day talking about social equality, don't think that I want it—don't think that the negro wants it. Does he intrude? Maybe some do. I do not doubt but there are isolated cases, but I know the heart of my people. I know my own heart. Why, sometimes I do not treat white people with courtesy—I know I have let bishops of my own Church come into the City of New Orleans and have not gone even where they were nor extended to them decent courtesy that I owed them as a general officer of the Methodist Church—God knows I have been extreme in that matter. I would not intrude upon the social life of any man or of any race anywhere when I think it is the least bit objectionable to him. I know that is the policy of my people, and we will underwrite that matter this morning. Don't make me responsible for every negro; I don't make you responsible for every white man. Bishop Mouzon said yesterday that every man should have a chance. That is all I want. I do not want anything else but simply a man's chance. I want a square deal and fair play, and I want the cards dealt fairly so that I can have a man's chance in the game of life. Now, you will indulge me, I am sure, just a minute. It is so easy for a man to trump up a position at a time like this. That you may quite understand me this morning, let me read where I stand on this matter, and this speech was delivered at Evanston and recorded a year or so ago when I had no thought of ever being on a Commission such as this:

Now, I state in a sentence the program: *The largest possible contact of the negro with the white man with the largest possible independence of the negro.* Both sides of the proposition are for the good of the negro, contact for inspiration and for ideals, independence for growth and for development. The weak grow by doing. A man ought not to do for another what the other man can do for himself. A man ought not to permit another to do for him that which he can do for himself. The day is passing when the white man is to work over the negro. Maybe the day is waning when the white man is to work among us, but the day is at sunrise when the white man is to work through the negro for the uplift of millions, and this latter program for stimulating the ideals of civilization can be carried forward just as effectively and even more effectively than by former methods.

With a selection made and with absolute recall upon this selection, the Church can work more effectively through the chosen men, preserve its ideals, carry forward its program, infuse and diffuse its spirit, and at the same time more assuredly keep the *esprit de corps* of the negro people and thus advance the kingdom of Jesus Christ.

That is where I stood then; that is where I stand now. I was greatly moved yesterday by the speech of Dr. Blackwell as I was by the other speeches. I do not quite understand what he meant when he referred to us as "Northern negroes." I have heard that before. I am not a Northern negro; I am a Southern negro, though I do not know just what that means. No, maybe I had better not say that. I am a negro who is humanized, Christianized, and Americanized, but I love my section. I fight for the South, I fight Northern negroes for the South and for Louisiana. That is to say, I stand up for my section. Now, I don't know exactly what you mean when you say "Southern negro" and "Northern negro." I live in New Orleans, and that is pretty far South, but I take it for granted, and I now speak with frankness, that you Southern men, all of you white men, ought to be tired of the negro who cringes and bows and scrapes and lives the life of a hypocrite and liar. If you don't know that they do, I know it. You know there are negroes who grin and don't mean it at all. There is no servile blood in me. If I thought I had one drop of it, I would open my veins and let it out. I hope, however, that every drop is thoroughly saturated with the humility of Jesus Christ. And in that spirit I try to live a humble, devout, God-fearing man. I do not know how much I have done, but I have tried to do my level best every day of my life to develop among my people a love for our section, for its industries, for our neighbors, and for all that would make for peace and happiness. Will you forgive me now just one minute? When I left you in January last, I left you under a great shadow. Pretty soon after that the angel of my life and heart left me and went home. I do not think she has gone very far from me. I think she is somewhere near now, and I know that when the day came that we were to take her remains out of the house white people whom I did not know, my neighbors whom I never sought but whom my wife had cultivated, visited the home and expressed sympathy and honored her. It was "Mrs. Jones" all the time. They brought flowers and put on her casket. They spoke kind words to her children, and they did many things that I could not quite understand down there in the Southland, and I said: "Thank God for this woman who was able to win her neighbors." I went to one white man and asked him why it was, and he said, "You know when that awful storm was in New Orleans and we were all so afraid, your wife came over and helped move our piano and helped care for my wife;" and he said, "Jones"—no, he did not say that, he said, "Dr. Jones, we loved her and we had to bring some flowers." And then the Catholic church was right next to us and every day the priest had the window next to us

opened and had his choir sing "Nearer, My God, to Thee." And he came into our house, too; he never prayed, but he came into the house and brought comfort by his presence. And the sisters came, too. They never prayed, but they said, "Thank God for such a woman." She did it; I could not. If God had not created the negro race; if Jesus Christ had not tasted death for every man; if the New Testament did not offer a message of salvation to all who believe in His name; if we were Calvinists, not Arminians, and if those called were only of a certain group; if we did not have in our ritual the invitation "If any man sin"; if I had not repented, or if, after repenting, I had led a worthless life; if I had not been given the right hand of fellowship into the Church; if I did not possess the power to think; if I did not aspire to be a man; if Christ had not made me free in deed and in truth—there would not be much difficulty in fixing my status at this hour. Mr. Chairman, Woodrow Wilson is my President. I pray for him, I teach my boy to pray for him, and so long as he is in the White House he represents me and the ideals of my nation. He has said that we are fighting to make this world safe for democracy. I am with him. Do you know that black men have responded to his call vigorously? They did not have to conscript us; we were ready to go, Dr. Ainsworth, before they began to call. And, did you know the other fact, that a larger percentage of our men responded to conscription and that of those thus called a larger percentage has been accepted than of any other class? We are at the front to-day. I have some fighting blood in me. My negro great-grandfather by actual record was a soldier at the battle of Guilford Court House. Then, I had a hand in the Confederacy. It happened this way: my father had a brother by the name of Sebron who had a wife and young baby and he was conscripted by the Confederacy, and my father, being single, volunteered to take his place so that Uncle Sebron might return to his family. My father remained on the works two days and then escaped, and was not with the Confederacy after that. We are at the front fighting, fighting to make a place for the weak nations. Seventy thousand of us are in a division, and more of us are going because we want to go. And may I ask the question, if we colored men are willing, and are men enough to answer the call, if we are willing to fight that the world may be safe for democracy, will you not make it safe for us? Six hundred thousand black troops from away down in Africa pierced the German lines. Thank God I have lived to see the day when it is a good deal more popular in America to be a negro than it is to be a German! You talk about German intrigue, you talk about the spy system of Germany, you talk about the Germans getting to

the negroes—there is no chance. There is not enough money in all the German Empire to bribe a single negro against this country. You white men can sleep in peace—our hearts are on the right side. There is one Declaration of Independence, one Constitution, one flag, one people. There is no hyphen in my Americanism. I am a true patriot and I love the flag. You made the flag, but the flag made us and we bathed its lines of red in our own blood and deepened the field blue by our own undivided loyalty. One of the chief assets you have in this conflict is the absolute, unwavering loyalty of ten million black men in this country. You can bank on that. We will die for this country. Now, if we are men there, and if the United States Army can put the negroes on the front, and if the Army is to be one Army in America, may there not be one Army of Jesus Christ? The other day in Texas, after I had spoken, a Methodist preacher of the Church, South, said that these differences were all imagination and that they were all going to die away. I sometimes think the white folks and negroes deal with each other so unnaturally anyhow. I don't understand it all. I was a good friend of and played and grew up with a Governor's children. There was no threat of social equality in that. His son grew up and is prominent, and every time I pick up the local paper and see where he has gone forward I am happy. But we have grown apart, I don't know why, maybe I am to blame in a measure, but we have grown apart and I am always sorry. Maybe you ask the question, Why don't you people withdraw from the Church? Do you stay here for office? God forbid. I do not want any office, men. Principle is above preferment with me, and whatever office I have to-day was not given to me by my people. It was given to me by the vote of an assembly eight-ninths of which was white, and can be taken away to-morrow as easily as it was given. You know it and I know it. Is it for money? There are men in the Church who have made generous offers to us in the way of money if we go out. They have said, "If you will go out, you can have your property." Why, we would be the richest negro Church in the world. Is it money? I don't want any price put on my head, my heart, or my convictions, whether it be ten dollars or ten million dollars. I want to be somewhere that I will be above money, above place, and above preferment. I have already answered the question as to social equality, that it is not for social equality. "Then why do you cause all this confusion, why do you remain?" I am asked. First, I believe it promotes the best interests of my people. I think it is best for my people to be somewhere close to a large Church with great ideals. I have been able to do things for my people, I have been able to say things in correction of their

lives and to give to them ideals that I never could have done if I did not have a strong organization behind me standing for those ideals. Then, you will excuse me: to give you a concrete example, I stood before a Conference the other day and lambasted those negro preachers about not paying a debt, and I did it straight from the shoulder—and I have to have the suffrage of those men. But I did not care for that. I was standing by the principles of my Church. Second, I stay in the Methodist Episcopal Church because I believe it is a Church founded on a New Testament basis and American democracy. I believe it is New Testament teaching for the Church to take into it all people, and I do not believe I should run at the first fire of a gun. Third, Bishop Mouzon said the other day that he loves his Church as he does his life. Well, I love my Church, I honestly do, with all my heart. I was born in it and was brought up in it. My grandfather was brought up in it and it has done much for me. But I love it beyond what it has done for me. I actually love my Church beyond and above all other Churches. Then I stay in my Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, because I believe a large part of my Church desires me to stay; and whenever the time comes when any large part of the people in the Methodist Episcopal Church does not want me in its communion, whether it is for convenience or organic union or otherwise, I shall not stay in that Church. If I believed to-day that I were unacceptable to any considerable number of the members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, I would step down and out. Self-respect would work automatically. I believe in my Church because it has made it better for the South. I referred just a moment ago to negro patriotism. Brothers, brothers of the South, you men were quite uneasy when the war broke out as to where we were going to be, but do you know—and you will excuse me now—we had unfurled the Stars and Stripes in our Southern schools forty years ago and had taught our children and our people to love the flag and to salute the flag. And so, when the war broke out, we had in the South a nucleus of patriotic negroes taught by our white men and white women of the North to love Old Glory, to love her folds and to kiss her stars, and so when the time came to call us we did not have to work up patriotism; we had it. The nation should subsidize the Church that sent men of the North down and taught this whole negro race to love the flag and to be true to what it stands for. Yesterday I saw that magnificent Haven Home. I did not even know that it was there, and I said, "God bless my Church"; and I will tell you, without any attempt to deceive, that there has not been uttered a single syllable in any school of our Church in the South antagonistic to the best interests of the

South. Our people have been down here simply teaching Jesus Christ. They have made us men and brought us to our own, and I love my Church for that and I am glad that you men have generously recognized the kind of work done in the South. Now, there are just two or three other things I want to say. Much has been said about the negro Church coming under; and so, to pursue some of the methods used by you and your friends, I thought I would get in touch with some of these negro bishops to find out if it were actually true that they were looking forward to us to bring them all together. So on Saturday night before I left home, I dictated a letter to all the negro bishops and I inclosed the proposition of the Rev. Dr. Blake and of that *Zion's Herald* up there in Boston, and I said: "Tell me frankly if it is true—maybe I don't quite understand—if it is true that you men are now going to come under the Blake proposition." And I will read two or three of the letters. I shall be brief; I shall not weary you. Here is one:

I want to say that the colored brother in the Methodist Episcopal Church is fighting a battle for the race and by all means should remain in the Church until a victory is achieved, for I believe ultimate good is coming to the race from these discussions.

The independent negro Methodist Churches are watching to see if the Methodist Episcopal Church will reverse itself on the negro question in this age of fighting to make the world safe for democracy.

We are watching to see if it will turn from universal Christianity to white Christianity. In conclusion, I wish to say that when the independent negro Methodist Churches get ready to unite they will not follow the leadership of Dr. Blake or any one else of like ideas. Any discussion of plans for the union of negro Methodists without calling said Methodists unto the councils and discussions is like staging the play of "Hamlet" with Hamlet left out.

Then a lot of the other bishops say about the same thing. Here is another bishop who asks me to publish what he says. I will not give his name here, but he is a bishop of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church:

The great Methodist Episcopal Church, making her advance in the South in the sixties and early seventies, presented the only true theory and practice of the Christian faith—namely, there was to be in the Church but one type of membership, regardless of color and racial distinction. And had that theory and practice continued with the passing decades, I hold that all the other negro Methodisms ought to have been, and ought to be to-day, in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Had that great Church continued in her first love for the negro race, and done what was in her creed and practice, to the extent of recognizing but one standard of membership, the negro Methodisms would have gained more by being in that Church than in negro organizations, whether united or in separate institutions.

This is all interesting, but maybe I had better not read all of these. I grow tired of them myself. But here is another I would like to read:

Replying to your letter of the 19th inst., I beg to advise you that I am heartily in favor of the unification of all branches of American Methodism having the Episcopal form of government, but I am unalterably opposed to the formation of any cleavage on racial lines.

I do not indorse Dr. Blake's position regarding the unification of all negro Methodists.

As to the preachment of *Zion's Herald* under the caption "For the Supreme Good of the Negro," issue of December 5, 1917—well, that was gratuitous.

The *Christian Advocate* (New York), Bishop Bashford, Bishop John W. Hamilton, and Dr. J. W. E. Bowen have recently emphasized the fundamentals of Christian democracy in a manner that has shorn pacificism of the camouflage of expediency.

Here is what another says of Dr. Blake's plan:

The scheme of Dr. Blake, I think, is the best all round that I have seen. But it will not appeal to the independent negro Churches, if for no other reason than because it has made and handed out to them without deeming them worthy of being consulted in making this provision. No one has been authorized to represent the independent negro Churches in thus planning for them.

I do not think that the colored part of the Methodist Episcopal Church should further humiliate themselves by accepting the kind of compromise indicated. My own personal, sincere judgment is that the negroes in that Church should accept separation on an independent basis and have another Methodist Church, rather than a side-show Methodist Church—the outgrowth of race prejudice.

Here is another from a C. M. E. bishop:

Now, as far as the African Methodist Episcopal Bethel and the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Churches are concerned, your statement regarding their withdrawal is correct as I see it; but when it comes to the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church it is different. We withdrew because we wished to do so, and the withdrawal proved to be in keeping with the desires of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. If, however, we had remained with them regardless of the fact that a majority preferred our going, I am quite certain that we should now be in great discomfort on account of the manifestation of racial prejudice in many phases. Being separate from them, and yet on the most friendly relations, we have comparatively little to meet on that line from them. I really would not wish to remain with them, knowing that a majority of them detested my presence.

Regarding Dr. Blake's plans, I would say they seem to offer a brotherly and fair solution to one question. I believe the negro membership needs the help of the white Church and that the white people need the spiritual touch of the negro members. I cannot speak for any except myself on the matter, though, and I think that in some respects if his plans are carried out it would be for good.

But your Church has stood for seventy years or more as a believer in the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, holding that the color of one's skin and the previous condition of his life should have nothing to do with the treatment accorded him. That is my principle, and anything short of that is not right in God's sight so far as I see it. But human imperfection brings us to consider the question in the light of what is best now. May God direct you in the entire consideration, and let us pray that the Spirit of Truth will lead you all in the best way in these vital matters.

They are all one way Here is another :

First, I desire to thank you on my own part for the statement that the colored Churches of this country will not subscribe to any program that they do not have a hand in making; and, secondly, for your other statement that at least one of the independent colored Churches does not exist by preference, but it exists as a protest against the unkind treatment received at the hands of their white brethren. Truly, these statements are correct.

Now, you ask me if the plan which is suggested by Dr. Blake and indorsed editorially by *Zion's Herald* would appeal to me or my Church as a basis for reunion of all negro Methodists. I answer for myself. No, and it is my opinion that I speak the sentiment of a vast majority of my Church when I say no.

You ask me, in the second place, if I think the negro members in the Methodist Episcopal Church should enter into such a compromise. My answer is that I seriously doubt it, and that upon the grounds that it is based upon a long and deep-seated prejudice, I care not who disputes it, and to me it carries with it concealed danger.

Listen carefully to this one :

I would regret very much at this time, when conditions in Church and State are so unsettled, to find any receding from the position which the colored leaders have so manfully contended for in your Church.

If for any reason the Methodist Episcopal Church reaches the conclusion that it desires to divorce its colored members, then I think that body so divorced should form an independent Church without any reference to a General Conference with which the Methodist Episcopal Church would have anything to do. This, in my opinion, would be a beautiful thing to do, if the time has come for a separation for any reason.

I do not think the negro members of the Methodist Episcopal Church should enter into such a compromise as Dr. Blake outlines. I am reasonably sure that his plan will not bring the union of the distinctively colored Methodist Churches so easy as he may think. You are quite right in your statement that these Churches will not take kindly to any program which they had no part in making. I think, on the whole, it is better for you to stand pat and let the other fellow do the squirming if squirming must be done.

Here is another :

I have openly declared that there will be no unification of the two Churches: First, because the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in the early seventies set apart their colored membership into a separate and distinct Church; and since they did not want their own colored membership in their bounds with equal rights and privileges they would not be willing to swallow the colored membership of the great Methodist Episcopal Church. Secondly, the great Methodist Episcopal Church would have to surrender great principles for which they had stood for too many years, and I could in no wise conceive of this Church doing such a thing without becoming despicable in the eyes of the religious world.

In answer to your first question, the plan of Dr. Blake, and editorially indorsed by *Zion's Herald*, would in no wise appeal to me or my Church as a basis for reunion of all negro Methodists, for the African Methodist Episcopal Church has authorized no one inside or outside of the Church to speak for it as touching the question involved; the African Methodist Episcopal Church stands as a protest against all religious discrimination on account of color, race, or previous condition of servitude, and it will

hold out no appeal to the colored membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church to leave their Church in order to permit the unification of the two great Methodist bodies and appease the prejudice of Southern Methodism.

Oh, I am tired of that myself; but there it is. There is absolutely no chance at all; and if you believe that these negro Methodists are coming under anything that is suggestive of subordination you are mistaken. The only way to get them in—and you could get them in before sundown—is to open the doors wide and take them in squarely as members of the Church. If you do that, you can have them in before sundown; they are not coming in otherwise. Now, I said I am a Southerner. My section has been moving up greatly in the last twenty-five years—even in the last six months. I was over in Chattanooga the other day and I saw a negro secretary of a white preachers' meeting—no, it was a meeting of all preachers in that city, and a white man was President and a black man was Secretary. The labor unions are taking negroes in. I went to a funeral the other day and there were five white carpenters, with the badge of their union on, who sat at the funeral of a negro. I said to the preacher, "What are they doing here?" and he said they belonged to his union. They walked around the corpse like the others and they had sent a floral offering and took their places in the funeral. In New Orleans white and colored carpenters and bricklayers meet together to deliberate, and that is down in the South. Now, I do not believe that you need fear anything. Somebody will say that Edgar Gardner Murphy was not altogether orthodox on the South. I think he was. He was a

sort of prophet. He said:

The apprehensions which have attended the progress of the negro have usually come to nothing with the arrival of the facts. Just as it was "conclusively established," before the general use of the locomotive, that passengers going faster than twenty miles an hour would certainly perish "from lack of breath," so it was confidently argued that the negroes when emancipated would rise and slay the women and children of their absent masters. Some of the nation's wisest men thought that emancipation would lead to slaughter. Later, it was contended that the immediate and universal bestowal of the ballot—an act of unpardonable folly—would lead to interracial war. But the oft-predicted "*negro rising*" *has never come*. It is always well in dealing with the negro, or with any factor of experience, to determine one's policy, not from the possible results which one fears it may produce, but from the actual results which one may see it does produce.

Now, what do we want? You will be interested in that. First of all, we do not want any caste written in the Constitution. That is fundamental. We do not do that in Louisiana, and we do not do it in the nation, and we should not do it in the Church. Second, we do not want any offensive name in whatever ar-

rangement you make. We want to be "Samuel" and not "Sambo." We want some sort of dignified name to whatever arrangement you may make. And it is fundamental that we should ask for representation in the General Conference. We will agree to the formation of our membership from one end of the country to the other in a centralized Conference. The Supreme Court of the United States has wiped out the Segregation Ordinances, and it was a unanimous court that did it and there were Southern men on the Supreme Court bench. Segregation in temporal affairs has been wiped out; and the only segregation that ought to obtain is segregation by the choice of the people, and there is a good deal of that. We don't have any trouble over that in Louisiana—we don't have any trouble in New Orleans. We will agree to show you our spirit. I don't think it is fair and I don't think it is democratic, but we will agree on a basis of non-self-support. Mark you, Dr. Goucher, the Church, the white Church, did not give the negro \$500,000 a year.

John F. Goucher: I would like it if it would.

Robert E. Jones: We negroes are a part of the Church that does that. Now, as to our representation in the General Conference, Wisconsin has eight delegates, with 28,000 members. The South Carolina Conference has eight delegates and 55,000. There are no small Conferences that have a membership between 900 and 1,000 among us—these are white Conferences; the smallest Conference we have is 5,000. But be that as it may, we are just as dead in earnest as you are. We will agree to a largely reduced representation in the General Conference. By the way, before the war three-fifths of an ignorant, helpless negro down on the plantation in the South was the basis of representation in Congress. A negro was three-fifths of a man. Five thousand counted for three thousand then. And in this new day I am at least four-fifths of a man, but to show that I am square I will agree to a reduced representation in the General Conference; I will not agree to elimination. I want the right of the initiative and referendum. I want to do just as I do in Louisiana: vote on constitutional questions. I do. Judge White, you referred to Louisiana and a conventional amendment on suffrage. You will have to have another constitutional convention soon. You have 20,000 negroes who can register and vote, no matter what terms you fix. Whatever terms for suffrage you fix, we are going to qualify, if it requires a bachelor's degree. We want the right of initiative and referendum so that whenever you want to change the constitution, whether we count for little or for large, we will have the right to pass on it. The question of the bishops does not concern us. We will agree to our bishops having jurisdiction within our territory—that is, that by some process they shall be limited to our people,

so that there will not be any fear that any of our bishops shall ever preside over a white Conference.

Bishop Leete: What is the concession you are making on that?

R. E. Jones: I said we will agree to a reduced proportionate representation in the General Conference, and we will agree that our bishops shall be limited to our jurisdictions. I think that is all. O brothers, let us not think the task is hopeless. Don't make us prevent reunion. Don't put upon me and upon my people any more burdens than we have, don't make us the scapegoat—we cannot stand it. Don't let us go out and have it said that these two Churches did not unite because the negro was not willing to do his share. We are. We don't want to stand in your way. Appreciate how we are situated, and God give us grace and wisdom to reach a final conclusion.

Mr. Simpson was recognized by the Chair.

John F. Goucher: We have been under a great strain this morning and we are all tired and with our minds now diverted, and I move that we adjourn with Mr. Simpson on the floor at the next meeting.

John M. Moore: We are using up a good deal of time.

Bishop McDowell: The truth is, this band and these troops have got into our nerves and muscles and eyes and elsewhere, and that is what is upsetting us. We just want to yell. All we have to do is to let Mr. Simpson have the floor, but withhold his remarks while we have a five-minute prayer for the country.

John F. Goucher: I will withdraw my motion then.

Bishop McDowell offered prayer.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: In the fall of 1876, the Sovereign Grand Lodge of Odd Fellows of this country met in the city of Atlanta, in this State. My father was the representative of the Grand Lodge of Pennsylvania to that Sovereign Grand Lodge. The representative from the State of Kentucky was a gentleman by the name of Durham. I have forgotten his first name, but he was afterwards, I think, Comptroller of the Currency under President Cleveland. I came with my father to that meeting, though not a member and not allowed to sit, and Mr. Durham's son came with him to the meeting. We boys—perhaps I ought not to say “boys,” for I was twenty-one years old then and had been for more than four years working as a carpenter and was, as my old Scotch forbears would have said, a “broth of a boy”—we two boys were drawn together like two strange boys in a strange town will be, and we used to roam around the city and out into the country. On one of our trips we came to what had evidently been a large dwelling. It was one of those beautiful dwellings which go so far to make the home life of the South, a dwelling that seemed in itself to speak of home and to make every one who loves a home, when he sees it, think of

home and to think that here is a sacred place devoted to that which is best in our humanity. This building had been burned down, and there was left standing but a corner of it. The stonework had broken away, starting from the roof above and running diagonally from window to window and from window to door, on both sides, leaving a tall corner standing; and as young Durham and I stood looking at it, I ventured to say, "I wonder what this building was?" There were three men standing a little distance off, and one of them came forward and—I will leave out the adjectives he used—said: "That is Sherman's Monument. It was burned down when the Yankee Sherman and the other Yankees like you came through this place." Dr. Snyder, the very thing you said yesterday would happen, did happen. Young Durham said, "I will see that the others do not interfere," and in just long enough to get two coats off there was a nice little scrimmage going on. When the scrimmage was over and the man who had made the offensive remark was getting on his feet, though his face did not look very much like the image of his Maker, he was right in his heart; for, without taking time to brush off his clothes, he put out his hand and said, "By God, I am glad we are both Americans, anyhow." Brethren of the Southland, by God the great, I am glad that we members of the Joint Commission are all Americans, and I am asking you as Americans to treat our colored brethren with the same generosity, notwithstanding anything you may have suffered on their account in the past, as that man of Atlanta treated me on that day. I have never forgotten that lesson and I have never lost my love for the Southern people, both from the action of young Durham and from the action of that man. Dr. Downey made a suggestion yesterday which perhaps I may be excused for referring to, as I wish to make it the beginning of a brief historical review. He called attention, you may remember, to the position of the old mammy and the old uncle in the Southern homes during the Civil War. I knew some of those old mammies and I knew some of those uncles and I knew some of the boys and girls that were pressed to the hearts of those old mammies and were dandled on the knees of those old uncles, and were told stories that lived with them as long as they lived. There was nothing suggested, in those days before the troubles began, of social equality or inequality in the present accepted use of those terms. The little girl who sat on her old mammy's knee never thought that she was white or the old mammy was black unless it was to wonder what the difference was, but always without causing any difference between them because of it; and we know that in the after years when the little boy and girl grew up, while there probably did arise in the heart of each some of that race consciousness about which so much has been said in the last six months

in the meetings of this Commission, that race consciousness was so subordinate to the love between the two that there was no feeling of difference, no thought in difference or of the possibility of injustice being done by the grown-up little girl or the grown-up little boy to the old mammy or the old uncle, or to any of the colored people that they knew, even after they separated, as Dr. Jones said awhile ago, by reason of growth. And when the Civil War came on you know, far better than I do, though I know some of it, that the old mammies and the old uncles of the homesteads when the parents were away, and the colored men who went with their masters into war, were the most faithful friends that the homestead people and the masters who went to war ever had and that no race consciousness separated them. Then the war was over. The South was destitute. She was in a position through which no people, so far as I know up to the present time, had ever passed. White masters were dead or impoverished. Men who had all their lives been dependent upon those white masters were thrown out into the world. These men, called upon for the first time to look out for themselves, fell an easy prey to the people who came to exploit them; and I am sorry to know, but the fact is, those exploiters came from my own section of the country. And when the exploiting was over, the white people who exploited them disappeared, and, as so often happens in human affairs, the people who were exploited and who least deserved to be punished were left behind to bear the awful burden put upon them by the days of reconstruction. Then, Judge White, your constitutional conventions met and your "grandfather clauses" appeared in the constitutions and statutes of your Southern States. They would not have amounted to a baubee except that they echoed the habits and the customs and necessities of your people at that time; and when the time comes, and please God it is near at hand, when the habits and customs and necessities of your people shall no longer require those things, you may call other constitutional conventions as Dr. Jones suggests, or you may leave your constitutions as they are and your statutes as they are, but those provisions will fail and die just the moment they run foul of those new habits and customs and necessities. And then, because of the war which is now devastating the world, we are coming again to a new era. The things that you knew a little while ago you will know no more forever. The better things of the world are coming to the front. He whose I am and whom I serve is cleaning house this day. He is cleaning away the things that are wrong, and He proposes to put in their places the things that are right; and he calls upon you and me, brethren of this Joint Commission, to take the first really forward step to that end. You cannot go back to the things of five years ago. For more

than a century this people gave heed to the words of Washington to keep ourselves free from entanglements with foreign nations. Those were true and good words, but no words of any man can be great enough to anticipate the new situations which arise during the course of the history of the world. We have now ceased to be an insular people. We have now ceased to be confined between the Atlantic and the Pacific. We are to-day, whether we will or no, hand in hand with the other people of the world to bring about the regeneration of the world either through the Church or otherwise. Which shall it be? Labor to-day is not the labor it was five years ago. It will never be the same labor again. Please God, there will never again be exploitation of the peoples of this land. Please God, the great wealth that grew out of the wrongful use of our transportation systems can never be repeated in this land. Please God, the high salaries of the supposedly great men of this country, the great fees of the lawyers, the great profits of the merchants, are all going to be more or less submerged in the rising wages of the laboring man. Please God, economically as well as spiritually, we are going to get nearer a common level, and each man is going to see in each other man more of a neighbor and more of a friend, more of one to whom he is closer by the very necessities of the case, than he ever was before. Brethren, are we going to be ready to meet these new situations as they arise? When I set out to study what was my duty on this Joint Commission, I knew of only one guide for me. Bishop Mouzon said that Bishop Hamilton was living unchanged his life of fifty years ago. I am going back nineteen hundred years. To know our problem, I read and re-read and re-re-read this great New Testament of ours from end to end, over and over and yet over again, that I might learn what was my duty in this Joint Commission. What we are endeavoring to solve is not a social or political problem, but a religious problem, a religious problem to be solved only by the precepts laid down for us nineteen hundred years ago, of which there has not been the dotting of an i or the righteous crossing of a t or the change of a thought in all those nineteen hundred years. For everything which faces us in this life, I do not care how it arises, whether individually or collectively, we can find in this glorious Bible of ours a guide to lead us to the correct conclusion. And when I look at that Bible and read it over and over again, I find there, brethren, that we are trying to follow in the footsteps of the Man who was the greatest Social Democrat the world has ever known. I find we are trying to follow in the footsteps of a man who was not only of an inferior race but a man despised even by a conquered people. We are trying to follow in the footsteps of a man who, so far as the world could see, was in a position where he could not even com-

mand the respect of a single person outside of His own household. He did not teach us social equality, but, please God, He taught us religious equality, and not one word or act of His, so far as the Bible shows, taught anything else. If our dear Lord were to walk into that door now with His hands pierced as they were, would He hold them out to those who desire to keep another race under? Or would He hold them out to those who are under? Would He not seek first of all to put those everlasting arms of His underneath those who need support the most, to hold them up until safety and happiness are theirs? That, brethren, as I see it, is the test we are called upon to meet this day. You may make arguments of all sorts, you may say, as Judge White did yesterday, that you cannot explain your position in favor of religious equality without condemning your actions in antagonism to social and political equality—but I say it is not so. You can put his position into a syllogistic form if you please. You may say as your major premise, “A superior and inferior race can never travel on the same plane; there is no equality between them.” You may take as your minor premise, “The colored race is an inferior race to the white one.” And then you may draw your conclusion, “Therefore, the colored race and the white race can never travel on the same plane of equality.” But what do you mean by “equality”? Theoretically at least, the colored and the white people are equal before the law. And religiously they surely have equality in the eyes of the Redeemer. That is the best part of it all. And so, brethren, as I was lying on the bed this morning thinking of our sessions of yesterday, my heart warmed within me as the hearts of Luke and Mark warmed as they were on the way to Emmaus in the long ago. As I lay there I thought of the speeches of yesterday. If we could only draw together on the line of three of the speeches we heard! None of you will think I am criticizing any other speech that has been made when I say that if we could just draw together on the lines of the speeches of Dr. Moore, Dr. Snyder, and Dr. Blackwell, we could settle this matter in twenty-four hours, details and all. Mr. Chairman, I have reached the time of life when, if the designation of the prophet be true, I can no longer see visions. To me it is to be but the dreaming of dreams; but I have found nobody, none of the interpreters yet, who have been able to point out any real distinction between the vision of the spiritually-minded young man and the dream of the spiritually-minded old man. And so, as I lay awake on my bed this morning, I dreamed a dream, a waking dream, and this is the dream and this is the interpretation thereof: I seemed to be standing on a little eminence. Before me on the one side was a great crowd of people—men, women, and children. How many of them

there were, I could not tell. They were Methodist people, both white and black. There may have been six million of them only; it may have been the present time, my dream told me not. It may have been a still larger multitude, and the time may have been the near to-morrow that we so gladly heard of yesterday. And as I looked at them I saw that about the center of that great mass of people they were crowded more together than elsewhere, and I saw that where they were crowded most together the faces seemed to be a little brighter and the hearts seemed to be a little happier. And I wondered why it was. And it came to me that those who were there crowded together were the recently united Methodists of the North and the Methodists of the South, and they crowded closer and closer together because their faces were made bright and their hearts made happy in the vision of a reunited Church and in accordance with the desire of our Lord. And I saw on either side of this great multitude a number who were not nearly so close together as were the others. They seemed to be stragglers, not yet knowing what to do; and then I knew that they were those who had not yet put their fingers in the nail prints in the hands of their Lord. They had not yet found that closeness to Him and that certainty of Him that those only have who need no such proof of his having risen. And I saw on the other side of the eminence on which I was standing a still greater multitude, and it was made up of whites and blacks and browns and yellows and reds; and they seemed to be waiting expectantly. They seemed worried about something and there was alternate hope and fear expressed in their faces. And out on one side of that greater multitude I found also men who would not join closer in with them, and I noticed that they were the autocrats of power and of wealth and the aristocrats of birth and of color. And I noticed that now and then they had sneers on their faces, but they were the sneers which were used to hide a troubled mind. But all that vast multitude in the center were waiting, waiting for those Methodist people over on the other side to come to them. And as I turned to them again I saw that they had but one banner and on it was the figure of our Crucified Lord. And on the bottom of it, as its only motto, was the "Whosoever will may come," which the Methodists have ever loved. And I saw them hurrying forward to this greater multitude on the other side, no man caring whether the multitude over there was of white or black or yellow or red, only anxious to get where they might bring help to those people over yonder, those people who, emerging out of the great war, were feeling the need of Christ more than any people ever felt that need before. As I looked the two multitudes intermingled one with another until I could not tell which was which, and in a little while, O blessed Lord, I saw

every one in that great commingled multitude down on his knees; and, bless God, I was with them, and I heard every tongue confessing that "Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father," and I heard over and above it all the great angel chorus, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will to men." Brethren, is there need for any further interpretation?

Dr. Ainsworth made various announcements, and the session was closed with the singing of the doxology and prayer by Dr. Du Bose.

FIFTH DAY, MONDAY, JANUARY 28, 1918.

MORNING SESSION.

The morning session of the Joint Commission convened in the Parish House of the Independent Presbyterian Church and was called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Cranston. Dr. C. M. Stuart conducted the devotional exercises.

The hymn, "He Leadeth Me," was sung. The twenty-fourth Psalm was read. Dr. Stuart led in prayer. The hymn, "We may not climb the heavenly steeps," was sung. Bishop Atkins led in prayer. The hymn, "Jesus, Saviour, Pilot Me," was sung.

The roll was called, and the following were present: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke, Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. A. Candler, W. B. Murrah, James Atkins. Ministers: Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. W. Van Cleve, J. J. Wallace, F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar; Rev. C. M. Stuart, reserve. Laymen: G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, G. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, H. W. Rogers, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock, M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White.

The Journal of the last session was read and approved.

Bishop Denny took the chair as presiding officer.

Secretary Harris read a communication from Mr. Robinson, of the Commission, stating that he expected to join the Commission shortly. He also read a letter from Mr. C. W. Fairbanks, regretting that he found it impossible to attend the sessions.

On motion duly made and seconded, a communication was directed to be sent to Mr. Fairbanks, regretting his enforced absence.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The general question is before us.

A. J. Lamar: It is not a very pleasant thing, as a brother remarked Saturday, to break the ice, but some one has to do it. I have been thinking very seriously about this question before us in the light of our previous discussion upon it. I appreciate the importance of the situation and I think it worth while to state to the brethren here assembled how one humble member of your body views it. I may not represent any one but myself—I do not know. I do not speak for my Commission. My friend Judge Reeves used a word the other day which was susceptible of misinterpretation in the light of the facts. He said we had had a caucus of the Southern delegates. If we have had a caucus, I am not aware of it.

E. C. Reeves: You were there.

A. J. Lamar: That is simply another instance of misunderstanding. I have no objection at all, and I think it is necessary under the circumstances to tell you exactly what that meeting meant and what it did, and leave it to you to decide whether it was a caucus or not. Dr. Du Bose, of our Commission, had received a letter from certain of our brethren in the Western part of the M. E. Church, South, with the request that he read it to our part of this Commission. Dr. Du Bose asked Bishop Denny to call the Commission together in order that he might read that communication. He read the communication. The Commission took no action whatever on the communication—did not debate it. Then some one suggested that it might be a good idea before we came to a final vote on any proposition, on which we might arrive at a tentative conclusion in that Joint Commission, for us to meet as a separate Commission and discuss the proposition by ourselves before voting for it finally. It was agreed that that would be a proper thing to do, and some brother then moved that we adjourn and we adjourned. That was the caucus. If I am incorrect in any of the statements I have made, I hope some brother will correct me. If I have stated anything that did not occur or if I have omitted anything that did occur in that momentous and all-important caucus, I hope some brother will tell me about it.

Bishop McDowell: Will Dr. Lamar yield the floor to me for a second while I say to him what I said to Judge Reeves the other day, that that is altogether within the limits of entire respect and propriety with reference to this Joint Commission and that nothing has taken place with you but what is common with the other Commission.

H. M. Du Bose: I remember one thing that occurred that Dr. Lamar has failed to state. It was said that a certain colored preacher who had had one of us white preachers occupy the pul-

pit for his Church had reported that since hearing the white brother his congregation was a good deal more satisfied with his preaching.

A. J. Lamar: Well, I will refer to that now enough to say that the white preacher was not I and it was not Dr. Du Bose.

John M. Moore: And it was not I—

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): You gentlemen are almost getting to the point of designation by elimination, and I shall have to object to that.

A. J. Lamar: Now, I have been diverted in this way and I want to get back to the question, because I realize the importance of time. I think the position in which the members of this Commission, North, and the members of this Commission, South, find themselves is a pathetic one. No man here is responsible for the reasons that underlie our different views on this important question. We are the heirs of these things. I do not believe in digging up the history of the past in order to read into it dying antagonisms and antipathies, and I do not refer to history with that view. Neither am I going back into the past, because I am an old man and the characteristic of old men is to dwell in the past rather than in the present or the future. I am a forward-looking man. I am much more than fifty years removed from slavery. I believe that slavery was indefensible from a New Testament standpoint, and there were very many men in the South—though you men who did not live in the South in slave times, as I did, do not know it—there were very many men among the best and the ablest men of the South and many women among the best and purest women of the South who had serious doubts on this question long before the Civil War broke upon us in its horror. It is not a new question. We are the heirs of the things that come here. I was a slaveholder in my boyhood. As a slaveholder I thank God that slavery has passed away. I fought for the Confederacy as a boy from fifteen and a half to seventeen years of age. I did my part. I believed I was right. I believed it as sincerely as you believed you were right. I have no apologies for it. We were devoted to a principle as we saw it, and we did our duty as we saw it. Nothing to apologize for back there, but I recognize the fact that it was better for us of the South that we did not succeed in the War between the States, better for this great nation, better for the world that we failed in our honest and somewhat strenuous endeavor. No regrets for that back there, none whatever. Why was I a slaveholder? Because my father was a slaveholder. Why was he a slaveholder? Because his father was a slaveholder. The men who acknowledged me as master, their fathers had acknowledged my father as master and their grandfathers had acknowledged my grandfathers as masters: I was heir to a system. I was bound

to it. Now, look for a moment at a piece of history that is correct, but it will not be so pleasant to the hearing of some here who were on the other side of that question. Bishop Hamilton referred to the emancipation of the slaves in the North, and how the North felt as the South felt before and after the slaves were emancipated. If you please, sir, those slaves in the North were not emancipated. When the State laws in the North were emancipating them in State after State the great majority of those slaves were sold by your fathers to my fathers before emancipation took effect. Is not that true, Bishop Hamilton?

Bishop Hamilton: That is so.

A. J. Lamar: Now, if you please, we of the South are not the sole sinners in this regard—not the chief sinners. I rather suspect that just before the close of the Civil War—for Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation did not become effective before the close of the war; it was intended to, but it did not for obvious reasons—I suspect if six months before the close of the Civil War the South had been given the opportunity to ship their slaves to Cuba they would very gladly have embraced it, and in doing that they would have done simply what the North did when they agreed to emancipate their slaves. These are facts. Now, that is enough of that. I have referred to all that stuff back there simply to show you that we are the inheritors of a condition for which we are not responsible. The result of all this shifting, of this gradual emancipation by the different States of the Union, was that practically the entire negro population of the United States was congregated in our territory; and while it became a national problem it became especially and acutely a problem for the people of the Southern States. These people were free. I am glad they were. The Southern people are glad. You may find a sporadic instance here or there in the South of some man who is not glad, but he is mighty lonesome. The great majority of our people recognize the fact that it is a good thing for the South that the system is gone, and that it was a bad thing for the South that it was ever born. Now, if you please, we were left at the close of the war with this population on our hands. If we had been let alone in the kindly relationship then existing between the vast majority of the ex-slaves and their masters, there would not have been any difficult problems. We would have gotten to them. We were on terms which permitted close approach to them. But instead of that there came down upon us some men from the North who settled in the South and who cast their lots with the Southern people. There were some admirable men, some men whom everybody respected and loved; but there also came down the sutler element, the lowest element in your Northern predatory class. They came down here to make merchandise of the colored man and of the white

man who was down. And in those days of reconstruction these men, for their own purposes, for selfish political preferment and financial aggrandizement, prejudiced the negro of the South against the white man of the South, and out of that came the evils with which the South has had to deal. No mistake was made in freeing the negro; a tremendous, a colossal blunder that amounted to a crime was made when upon millions of people, uneducated, absolutely unaccustomed to self-direction, absolutely ignorant of any principle of government, was conferred the right of franchise. You do not appreciate what it meant to us. What difference did it make to the great State of New York that one per cent of its population was thus ignorant and yet had the franchise, or two per cent or five per cent in some of the other Northern States? But it made a very great difference in the Black Belts of the South, where my lot was cast and where there were seven negroes to one white man. That was the situation with which we were confronted. The franchise was conferred upon them; they were incapable of exercising it. Then, we of the South were confronted with this proposition: Shall we turn over to this mass of ignorant unpreparedness the direction of our country, the control of its taxation and its finances, the direction of all its affairs? Shall we do that? That meant the ruin of our civilization. It meant the ruin of the Church and of the State. There were two other alternatives. There were three horns to this dilemma. One was, Should we massacre them, should we destroy the race? The other was, This has been forced upon us. We know it is a mistake that involves every interest of our people for all time. It has been forced upon us. We have to swallow it; but it was forced on us, and we will simply treat it in the way it deserves, as a nullity, and not allow the negro vote to count. That was a dangerous thing to do. Southern men realized that it was a very dangerous and a very demoralizing thing; but there you were with the three choices: Kill them, which was too horrible to think of—our relations to them had been too kindly and too close. Our respect for our God and the principles inherent in our civilization forbade that we think of that for a moment. We could not recognize their vote and turn over to them the absolute government of our States and of our cities and our counties. That implied the ruin of everything we held dear. There were the three choices we had, and I defy any man to say that we did not choose the least of the three evils. That accounts for the political treatment of the negro in the South. That history back there we need to bear in mind; it is important. I am referring to it simply that we may see the foundations of the different views of the negro in America entertained by the average Christian man, the average Methodist man of the North and the average Christian Methodist man of

the South. These things have come to us as an inheritance; we are not responsible for them, and yet they are very real things. I listened to the speeches made here by my brethren from the North, and in many of them I could see that you idealized in your love of freedom—to which I bow and in which I share—you idealized the American negro, and in your dealings you are dealing with your ideal. We think we are dealing with the actual, with the negro as he is, and we are just as firmly convinced that we are right in our judgment on this question as you are convinced that you are right in your judgment. A good many things have been said here that reveal that. Some things have been said here that in my judgment were not wise. I think not. Bishop Hamilton used a phrase about the best and strongest people being a compositely built people. I think that was unfortunate; but when he said that, he directed our attention to the very thing that as an awful specter stands back here behind everything else in the minds of the people of the South: the fear that at some time in the future, through the lower strata of the white race, there shall be the amalgamation that will give us a composite citizenship in these Southern States instead of the purest block of Anglo-Saxon American citizenship that exists in this nation. And I think—I have no doubt in the world of the Bishop's honesty, and I can sympathize with the breadth of sentiment that lies behind his views. I can. And yet I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that he is mistaken; if it needs any argument on that point, I simply point you to Mexico or to Cuba or to any Central American Republic and then to these United States of America, and I ask you, Which is the strongest race and which the best civilization? And yet, if you press the logic far enough, if you press to its ultimate conclusion the logic that demands the absolute equality of the negro and the white man in every respect, you arrive at Bishop Hamilton's conclusion. That is back yonder behind it. Think it over. Think it over and see if it is not so. We believe that it is, and it is for that reason that we believe that it is best that these two races, while dwelling together in amity and, God grant, in mutual helpfulness, shall remain separate as races to the last minute of recorded time. We believe that. We believe that it would be to the ultimate advantage of the negro. We are sure it would not be to the ultimate advantage of the white man for this line to be broken down; and if there is anything in the world upon which the mind of the South is made up, the most conservative and God-fearing in all the noble elements as well as some elements that are not so admirable—if there is anything upon which we are a unit, it is this thing, and we just simply cannot yield. I could not do it and be true to my honest convictions of what is right and good in the sight of God. And if the men on this Commission from the South could

have reached your proposition to have the negro in the same Church with equal rights and equal powers with the rest of us in the same organization, what good would it do for us to agree to it? You could not put it through the General Conference; and if by hook or crook you got it through the General Conference by a narrow majority there is not a man here, not the most enthusiastic of our Southern delegation, who does not know that it could not possibly pass the Annual Conferences to which it must go. It seems to me that we have reached or are likely to reach an *impasse*—I beg pardon; I am told that the proper pronunciation is *impasse*—but I will stick to my old pronunciation and call it an *impasse*. That is according to Lamar, and I think according to the best French dictionaries. Now, I judge from the drift of the remarks here by my brethren from the North, whom I honestly respect, and for many of whom, with whom I have had the privilege of being thrown intimately in this Commission, I entertain a very affectionate and brotherly regard—I think Bishop Cooke and I could be ideal chums if you could just let us alone, and I think even Brother Downey and I could get to be very fast friends, and I am sure that is true of almost every man on this Commission. Brother Jones has not a better friend on the Commission than I am in the sincere desire for him of everything that is good—

W. N. Ainsworth: And willingness to help.

A. J. Lamar: And willingness to help. That leads me to another point that was brought out. I am satisfied that my brother Blackwell the other day in some of his statements unintentionally reflected unjustly upon my people and his people. I am satisfied of that. The impression he made was that we were doing nothing for the negro, that in a spirit of aloofness we were cutting ourselves off from him, that we were not helpful to him. That is a very great mistake. We are doing much, and a large body of us—and I pray God that it may be a majority in our General Conference which meets in May—realize that we have not done one-tenth of what we ought to do and of what we can do, and who are determined that we must do more as a Church for the help of our negroes. We have done a great deal more than I can tell you. There is not a negro church in the South—there may be one or two, but I don't know of any; it is so nearly universal that I may use the expression—there is not a negro church in the South that has not been built largely by Southern Methodist money.

A. F. Watkins: You mean Methodist churches?

A. J. Lamar: Yes, and I think a good many Baptist churches and Congregational churches. It is generally true. The day before I started to this Commission—and I do not say this in

any improper spirit; those who know me know I do not feel that way—the other day before I started to this Commission a colored brother came into my office (and they come in on an average, I think, of once a month throughout the year) and said, “Doctor, I want to talk to you a minute.” I invited him to take a seat, which he did, and I said, “What is it?” He said, “Our church is in debt.” I did not ask what church; but he told me before he got through, and it was a Colored Methodist Church, but that did not make any difference. “Our church is in debt and we are liable to be sold out under a mortgage. I have to raise \$800 before a certain day to get out of trouble, and I want you to help.” I said, “Sure, I will help.” I looked at the list and I saw Brother Maddin’s name just above with a subscription. I looked over the list and it was entirely a white list. And that thing is going on all over the South.

J. M. Moore: And other places, too.

A. J. Lamar: Certainly, we are brother victims in that regard. We are doing it in another way. There are innumerable Methodist homes in the South—I will not say innumerable, that is too broad—but there are many where at the family altar in prayer to God in the morning the servants are all present. That is the custom with what you brethren would call the aristocracy of the South; and it is the aristocracy of the South, for there is only one real aristocracy on this earth and that is God’s aristocracy. Brethren, we are not unmindful of our obligations. I have no better friends in the world than I have in, perhaps at the outside, a dozen old Southern people who were technically and at the time legally my slaves and who still linger amongst us, and they know they have no better friend than I am. I was stationed a few years ago in the city of Montgomery within twenty miles of my old plantation; and every now and then I would receive a call from one of them and we could commune together concerning old times, and frequently both of our eyes would be a little wet. And those brethren I know so well have one little weakness. I know when Terry or Henry or Tom Jackson came to see me they would not consider the visit complete and the reception as cordial and as friendly as it should be unless there was some coin passed at the end of the interview—and the coin was always passed. No, we are doing the best we can with the colored problem. Now, brethren, you cannot ask us to surrender honest convictions. If you do it, we would despise you. Now, there is a situation which looks like an *impassé*. We might as well deal with it honestly and candidly: and what shall we do? Does it mean that unification is impossible, that it is a failure, that we are forever to stay apart? I think not. I do believe that it means that at the present moment

we cannot get together. I do. I mean in an agreement that will carry with both Churches and that will make unification at once complete—an accomplished fact. I am very sorry—devoutly sorry—but I think so. But hold a minute! I believe in the principle of unification. I believe it would be the best thing for us to get together if we can do it properly. I do not believe it would be best for us to get together on a basis which would be very displeasing to as many as a quarter of a million of your people or on a basis which would be unacceptable to a quarter of a million of our people. We will never get them all unanimous. When we finally get together, it will be by running over a small irreconcilable and forever unreconstructed minority. But if there is any considerable opposition, we cannot afford to press to an immediate issue a thing which is dear to all our hearts at such a cost. It would be paying too much for it. Phillips Brooks once said that the trouble with us is that we are in a hurry and God is not. There is a good deal in that. Think about it. We are going to get together. Every step that we have taken here has been a step in that direction, and has put us where we can get together in the future. But I honestly believe that in the present situation, unless you can come to the position I have laid down this morning, an irreducible minimum as I see it, we would lose in the South part of our membership at least numerically equal to the negroes who would be retained in the Church. And I just simply cannot agree to it so far as I am concerned, speaking only for myself. Now, hold on, brethren, I know this is disappointing to you, as it is disappointing to me. I believe the best thing we can do—but I don't think we are ready for it this morning and I am not going to press it, I just throw it out for you to think over—I believe the best thing we as a Commission can do would be to report back to our General Conferences that on account chiefly of this thing, the position of the delegates from the M. E. Church being this, and the position of the delegates from the M. E. Church, South, being this, we have been unable to harmonize these differences, and we therefore report back to you for your decision as to what further steps shall be taken toward unification. We suggest three things, and in the meantime, before unification has been completed, we enter into an agreement on these three points. Let us have a Council of Coöperation or a Council on Coöperation, the decision of which Council shall be final, to which shall be referred all questions of disagreement as to the building of churches in the future. Secondly, we recommend that the right to transfer without the formality by which we receive ministers from other Churches be established between the M. E. Church and the M. E. Church, South, with power, whenever the two bishops concerned in the

two Churches shall decide, so that the bishop of the M. E. Church could transfer a man to the M. E. Church, South, and a bishop in the M. E. Church, South, could similarly transfer a man to the M. E. Church without any more formality than we now have in transferring a man from the North Georgia to the Alabama Conference. Thirdly, that the right of ordination be recognized as a right of a bishop in the Methodist Church, whether North or South—the power to ordain a man who has by due process been elected to orders as a deacon or an elder. What we need is for our people to get used to an idea, accustomed to it. Take every ten men who look unfavorably upon our negotiations, and out of that number you will have two who will drop off in the course of a year, I do not mean that they will leave the Church or be expelled. I do not mean that they will drop off in that way. I mean that they will change their views from thinking over the thing and hearing it discussed. In two years you will have half of them and in a little more time you will have all of them except the negligible quantity that is always in a minority on any question. If we would get together on some working plan like the one I suggest and let it work for four years, there would be a change in the views of a vast number in regard to unification favorable to unification, and it would not be many more years before the time would be ripe for us to come together and perfect the union which we think desirable and which many of us hold dear to our hearts—it would not be many years before it could be done. But we cannot hasten it. I believe it would be disastrous to one Church or the other to hasten it now. I could go on and say many other things, and there are two or three things I wanted to touch upon that have been said here, but I hardly think it is necessary. I have put before you the main points, as I feel, about this question. I pray God that we may be guided to wise conclusions. Before I close I must say one thing. We have had a horrible lesson in the South of hastening union of two kindred bodies, one Synod and the other Episcopal, before the people were ready. The Cumberland Presbyterian Church and the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America were united by action of their highest Church courts, and the result has not been to the glory of God. It happened several years ago. In the newspapers since we have been in Savannah I read of the decision of a lawsuit by the Supreme Court of the United States growing out of that controversy. There have been heart-burnings and bickerings and strife. The kingdom of God has been hindered rather than advanced in a good many places, and a great many honest, well-meaning, devoted plain people have been grievously wounded and estranged from the Church because the Churches were united before the time was ripe. I am ready right now, so far as that is con-

cerned, if we can come together on a basis that will not be much of a surrender either to you or to us.

Bishop Hamilton: I rise to a question of personal privilege. I never intend to interrupt a brother while he is speaking. I intend to keep wholly within my privilege. I do not desire to answer a thing that has been said by my brother further than to say that I hold in my hand the stenographer's report of what I did say. This report was handed me since I have come into this room and I have not touched one word of it. I desire to read it and I desire every member to hear every word of it, and I am sorry that two of the members of this Commission have gone from the room. I now desire to read from the stenographic report exactly what I said.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The personal privilege is admissible, because I understand Bishop Hamilton claims he has been misquoted.

Bishop Hamilton: Yes.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That forms a parliamentary basis.

Bishop Hamilton: Within the personal privilege, before I read what is set out here, for it is a paragraph within all the rest, I certainly will be permitted to say that in speaking I had distinctly said that I had nothing in view whatever except association in the General Conference, with no reference to individual Church association or Conference association, and the very thought of miscegenation was not in my mind. I was as far removed from it as the Kaiser from the desires of the American people. Here is what I then said:

I am ready with my little knowledge of history to go back to every single racial segregation on the face of the earth and show you that races by mingling, by emigration have alone been able through mutual helpfulness to arrive at any sort of progress.

If you can find a single impression by any word there that would lead any one to suppose that I was advocating or even favoring any such far-reaching conclusion as my brother seems to infer; I am ready in this presence to beg the pardon of the brother whose spirit to me is most excellent and to whose every word I have listened with great pleasure.

A. J. Lamar: I am very sorry indeed that I misunderstood Bishop Hamilton, as I see I did; but I think in justice to myself I should say this, that several other brothers with whom I have talked understood him just as I did. It is very unfortunate. I am sincerely sorry for it, and I most humbly apologize.

Bishop Cooke: I did not intend to speak on this subject at all. Having, with Bishop Murrah, Dr. Thomas, my amiable friend Dr. Lamar, and Dr. Downey, done the work on the Judi-

ciary Committee, I thought perhaps that we had done all that would be required of us and that we would leave these other subjects to the gentlemen who have been making a specialty of them. And I do not rise now to go into any extended remarks, or to elaborate any form of thinking upon this subject, but simply yielding to a suggestion which arises from listening to this address by Dr. Lamar. I have been a member of the Commission on Federation from the beginning. From that beginning up to the last meeting of that Commission at Baltimore I was Joint Secretary with Bishop Hoss, and much work was done by the Commission; indeed everything that has been done for the furtherance of unity was accomplished by that Commission: the Common Catechism, the Common Hymn Book, and the form of worship. So I have had an opportunity of listening to eminent men in both Churches during the sessions of this Commission. But I say to you that from that now far-away day (and I see around me the faces of bishops who have gone home to their God) until this time, I have never heard such addresses as I have heard in the last few days in this assembly, addresses of an exceedingly high character and highly appreciated by all of us. I do not propose, myself, to meddle with this particular question. I have lived too long in the South not to know the difficulties of the situation. I have seen sea gulls and ducks skimming along the surface of the water, but sublimely unconscious of the unfathomable depths beneath; and I am not going to try the quicksand and marshes, nor be like the Irish pilot who was inquired of by the Captain of his vessel, "Do you know all the rocks in this channel?" and a little bit afterwards, when there was a big hole in the hull of the ship and they were fished out of the water the Irishman said to the Captain: "That was one of them." It is not only necessary to know where the rocks are, but also how to avoid them. I heard the speeches of Dr. Snyder and Dr. Blackwell, fine, hopeful speeches, radiant of the coming sun of a new day, brightening the present and gilding the future. They were prophetic. I listened intently to Judge White's paper and to this fine address from this splendid man, Dr. Lamar. Doctor, I just can't help loving you.

A. J. Lamar: The same here.

Bishop Cooke: I have listened to these addresses, and I say to you that from my knowledge of the situation the statements which Judge White presented and that Judge Lamar—

T. N. Ivey: Judge Lamar?

Bishop Cooke: Well, he bears an honored name. Those addresses present exactly the situation as it exists to-day. Now, what can we do about it? Does any man presume to criticize the whole South, the Christian men and the Christian women

who have been described by these men with Christianity as others interpret it? With that as their conception of the Church of Jesus Christ? How can we reconcile these apparently irreconcilable opinions? I think that is a matter for men who study closely Christian ethics and with large charity in their souls. It is very evident that, whether consciously or unconsciously, there is the feeling that there is a large element of human living, of human activity outside the realm of religion.

Frank M. Thomas: Say that again, Bishop.

Bishop Cooke: I am speaking extemporaneously, and cannot repeat every word exactly.

(The stenographer then read the last few sentences of Bishop Cooke's remarks.)

Bishop Cooke: That sounds well. I had no idea that it would sound as well as it does. That is to say, many think that the gospel of Jesus Christ does not, and was never intended to, relate itself in its teachings to all the complexes of life; that there are many spheres of life which are non-religious and non-Christian—observe, I do not say un-Christian, but non-Christian—which the ethics of Jesus Christ does not relate to, that religion is a matter not of complexes, not of the price of potatoes nor the value of a coal mine, but that religion relates solely to questions between a man's soul and his God, and that outside of that realm there is a vast sphere of living which men pursue according to their own best judgment guided by what seem to them to be the necessities of the situation. That is why I think there are thousands of people in the Southern States who do things and write things and say things which are not understood by people in other sections, because they hardly know how to reconcile these things with their interpretations of Christianity. So I take that to be the explanation. Now, you may criticize that as you please. You may turn it down as an erroneous view; but that does not change the facts, if they are facts. And I want to say to you that these thousands and hundreds of thousands of people in this country and other countries are not alone in that opinion. Some of the very brightest minds in Germany, publicists, professors in the universities, and leaders of the sociological movement—such men as Nauman, who left the Immer Mission and took up a particular kind of social work—all believe that the ethics of Jesus does not touch all the complexes of life. I think it is a wrong doctrine, because when carried to its logical conclusion it is the justification of everything that can be comprehended under the universal word "necessity." I do not believe one blessed thing of it. Now, here we are, Dr. Lamar putting his view formally for his Church, and here we are on the other side. We have a conception of the Church which would not allow us, if I understand my own Church at all—which would not

allow us for a single minute to adopt that sort of ethics. In the first place, we do not feel that these Methodist Churches are our Church. Notwithstanding peculiar notions of it as a human institution, this is the Church of God. And it is not for us to set up bars or close gates within the Church of God in the things which pertain to the rights and privileges of the believers in the Church of God. We feel that every man that is born of God has equal rights in the kingdom of God, and if the Church of Jesus Christ is a reflex of the invisible kingdom, he has all the rights and privileges in the Church of God that any other man born of God has. No man has a right to subordinate him and say to him, "You sit here and I sit there," for He who took the towel and girded himself and washed the feet of His disciples, forever as an example to those who shall come, has put a crown of glory upon the lowest servant in the serving kingdom. Our Church believes in the universality of equality in the kingdom of God. And the strange thing about it is that, somehow or other, that thought is harmonizing itself with the movement of God in modern history. Brethren, this is a deeper ocean that we have crossed; there is more in this than we see. When I listened to this blessed man of God the other day, I thought to myself: Is the thought of God really the union of the Churches or is it to force to the front in America the rights of the colored man, after all, in the kingdom of God? Is that what God is driving at in a roundabout way? Because, in England, in the Balkan States, in Macedonia and Servia and Roumania, and even in Germany itself, there is a movement among the people and a shaking of the nations. It is a movement which did not begin yesterday. All you have to do to see the upheaval, the growing unrest of the vast mass of humanity, is to go back to the struggle of the common people in the Bill of Rights in 1831-40 in England, and to study the history of Liberalism from that day to this, the fight between the upper and the lower. It is pitiable to read about English Methodism in some of its aspects and to see the excuses for its decline. "We do not get so many converts out of the Sunday school;" excuses that are invented, to show why British Methodism has not succeeded, has not come to the front as its history would lead you to expect it should have come. That is not the point, however. The decline of Methodism did not begin yesterday in Britain, nor last year, nor the year before. It began away back in 1840 or 1845 when the people of England were struggling for their political rights and British Methodism lined up with the Tories and lost its grip forever upon the masses of England. There is where the philosophy of this thing has its root. You want to study sociological forces, these mighty mystic forces which work in human society. He is the statesman who studies the play of

these forces and endeavors to ascertain by their trend what must be the inevitable conclusion. Now, this great movement of humanity, this struggle for freedom, this struggle for equality, this struggle for recognition is everywhere. It is underlying this work. It is underlying the whole revolution in Russia. It is underlying the discontent in Germany among the Social Democrats. Thrones are rocking and the great masses of the people are coming to their own, and they are going to get it. You cannot turn back the tides of the ocean. No feeble barriers will ever keep back the onward rush of the mighty hosts of democracy in this world—and we are going to have it in the United States. The test of the United States is not this war—it will be when this war is over. There is where the testing time is coming and there are dark days ahead of us. You need not think that the great labor unions, socialist unions, even the corporations and the trusts in this country that are now under governmental supervision—you need not think they are going to settle down in a nice soft way as before. Humanity will never rest there. It has an indefinable goal. God is in this movement. God is pushing it out. It does not always succeed in going on straight lines—life never does. Life is a blind thing. It tries this way and that. Evolution never goes in a straight line. Progress never moves in straight lines. There are no straight lines in nature. Will the Church of God be left high and dry behind the onward movement of humanity? Will the Church of God say, “We will not sympathize with this movement; we are going to be conservative, we are going to sit here and manage our affairs as they have been”? Then what? This will happen. Carlyle says somewhere that the Church in France was like a fat ox tied up to a stall waiting to be fed. And what will become of the Churches? I tell you the day is coming when a man will feel that the Church is not a necessity to him. Religion may be a necessity, but men will not feel compelled to accept the dictum of the Church. They will leave the churches behind. Even now we have this feeling in our Protestant denominations aside from the Romanist religion. The Romanists believe that the Church is a necessity to men; we seem to believe sometimes that they are a necessity to the Church, and unless the Churches get in line with the movement of humanity then humanity will leave the Churches. It will not need them, and it will not need them for the simple reason that God will not need them. They will no longer be organs of the Holy Ghost. They will no longer be the Voices of God, they will no longer be the organization through which the Spirit of the Living God will work its ministry for the Christianizing of politics and of commerce, art, literature, of everything else. So that instead of there being a vast sphere of human life and activity outside the

realm of religion, religion itself will permeate every activity of man, will enter into every thought and every feeling of the heart. It will sanctify society as it has never before, because it will be the day of the King, the coming down of the new Jerusalem out of heaven. It is the Church of Jesus Christ that we must stand for. But if we give way now, recognizing all that Dr. Lamar and Judge White have said, it will be, not the birth of a new day for Methodism; it will be its funeral.

George Warren Brown was recognized by the Chair.

A. J. Lamar: I wish to say before Mr. Brown begins his remarks that I cannot ask the personal privilege now and therefore will not claim it, but I shall want to make a few feeble remarks later on.

George Warren Brown: I am glad that I do not voice the opinion of Dr. Lamar with regard to the consistency of our now coming to an agreement for unification. Brother Lamar would say "die" so far as our efforts as a Joint Commission are concerned at this time. The difficulties that he has outlined are the things that show what men are; but all things are possible with God. I represent a city of nearly one million people wherein we have the two Methodisms working in two camps. We have in that city a very large Roman Catholic population and influence. If the two Methodisms were in one organization, their influence in St. Louis and the entire Southwest of these United States would be multiplied several times; and God knows that Protestant Christianity and Evangelical Christianity should have no handicaps in St. Louis. This morning there is in St. Louis another joint meeting of Methodist leaders. We have in St. Louis this Monday morning, as we have had for more than two years past, a joint meeting of the Methodist preachers, North and South. Every week these men have been praying that unification might come without being long deferred. You have heard already several reports from St. Louis that have come to this meeting. I hold in my hand a telegram which was sent yesterday and which reads:

ST. LOUIS, January 27, 1918.

George Warren Brown, De Soto Hotel, Savannah, Ga.:

Rice, Lee, and a few of us would like to know confidentially if there are hopeful signs on horizon. Could you give us an opinion as to the situation?

BENJAMIN YOUNG.

That opinion is asked so that it may be taken to the joint session of the Methodist ministers in St. Louis to be held this morning. Here is my reply, sent last night:

Commissioners more serious than at previous meetings. Outlook fairly hopeful.

Did I answer too optimistically? I hope not. I am, this morning, in receipt of three more telegrams which were sent yesterday:

Membership of University Church, South, unanimously adopted resolutions for Church unity as adopted by preachers' meeting.

C. E. BURFORD, *Chairman Official Board.*

Maple Avenue voted unanimously at both services for union. Enthusiastic applause followed this action. See to it that nothing prevents its consummation so far as your Commission can effect it.

E. COMBIE SMITH.

Here is another one:

A large and representative congregation at Grace Church this morning indorsed unanimously by rising vote the resolution passed by the Methodist ministers' meeting of St. Louis urging the Commission on Unification to spare no pains and halt at no difficulty till they have found a way to unite our great Churches in one working body throughout the world.

W. H. HENBY, *Secretary Official Board.*

These telegrams, and others that have been received and read at the meetings of this Joint Commission, indicate the concern that is now permeating the atmosphere of St. Louis Methodism. We are on the border. This Joint Commission now has in its hands Methodism's great responsibility with its world opportunity. We are legally chosen plenipotentiaries to bring together and unite our Methodist forces. What will be the result of our efforts? We have a serious responsibility to stop waste. We have a world example before us to-day. The morning papers say that we are going to put on Liberty Bread this week. God grant that we, as the representatives of these two great Methodisms of this country, may commence to partake of the same kind of bread, a bread brought about by the principle of sacrifice; and if we forget this principle of sacrifice, how can we hope to get together? Golden moments are these. "Halt at no difficulty" seems to be the ringing note from St. Louis. Our responsibility must recognize six millions of white brothers in a proportionate degree with three hundred and fifty thousand colored brothers walking straight and standing erect before God. His whole kingdom must have our major consideration. I shall not sell out principles in my consideration of the interests of the negro, but I am not going to take the position of leaning backward as I attempt to stand straight in my sincere desire to consider the negro when I have God's kingdom to consider. I am going to do right as God gives me to see the right toward my negro brother. I was a member of the Special Subcommittee on the Status of the Negro last summer. Brother Ainsworth, Brother Maddin,

Dr. Van Cleve, and myself were that committee. We met at Nashville and gave the matter our very serious thought, as we had prayed over the matter before coming together, and we came to an agreement at that time on the Associate General Conference plan. That report was taken to Traverse City and you remember—those of the committee particularly know about it—a minority report was brought out. Then it so happened that the Status of the Negro was put off, hoping to take it up at the end of the Conference; but it was finally avoided entirely, and thus we come together at this time and this is the burden of our concern. We all believe that this is the crux of the whole situation, that if we can get together on a plan to meet the situation with regard to the Status of the Negro there is no question about our getting together on all the other points, and we have obtained victory instead of defeat and success in place of failure. I say to you that I shall feel ashamed to go home feeling that I have left unturned any stone that would contribute to a constructive plan to meet our responsibilities as a Joint Commission on Unification. Now, we have the preferential report and the alternative report brought in by our subcommittee that has been approved by the entire Committee on the Status of the Negro. I believe, in fact, my conscience tells me, we have in that preferential and in that alternative report the basis for unification that will meet the conscientious approval of every member of this Commission if we will rise above trivial things and look beyond our prejudices and the environment of our lives and will put God's kingdom first in place of holding minor things right in front of our eyes. Oh, may we put God first and may we have success!

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): It is quite difficult, when several members rise at once and you hear their voices simultaneously, to determine who should be recognized. I am not sure, but I think the Commission will know, certainly those who know me will know, that I am trying to do the right thing. I recognize Dr. Watkins.

A. F. Watkins: I find great satisfaction in the thought that in my attitude toward the question of the union of the Churches I stand where my fathers in the Mississippi Conference stood, when, at their annual session following the General Conference of 1844, after having adopted a series of resolutions, prepared by the hand of my honored father, expressing their conviction of the necessity for the organization of the M. E. Church, South, and appointing their delegates to the Louisville Convention, they strictly enjoined upon these delegates that they *keep the door open for union with our brethren of the Northern Church*. The Mississippi Conference, represented by William Winans and his associates, fought as vigorously and as powerfully as any section of the Southern continent for the views which they held

to be of prime importance in that great controversy. But the Mississippi Conference was consistent with itself when it looked upon that division as a great calamity and went on record in no uncertain terms as to the desirability of a union with the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. I believe that at that time the great tragedy was unavoidable, but I believe it is not in the providence of God that always that line should be run across the face of our continent dividing into sections the sons of Wesley in America. During our first meeting in Baltimore I declared, with a degree of candor that possibly was indiscreet, that, although from the extreme South, I believed most earnestly in the union of the Churches. I have not, as some of my brethren seem to have done, put any special emphasis upon the word "unification" as if it involved anything but union. I look upon unification as a process leading toward union; and the thought and the desire of my heart are for a reunion of the Churches that were divided in 1844, with as nearly a return to the original status of the Church as the changed conditions and the experience of our Church in the two sections of our common country will allow. I recognize these changed conditions, brought about by the experience of 1844 and the years that followed, and I look with great pleasure upon the thought that both the Church, North, and the Church, South, have declared their conviction of the desirability and the feasibility of a plan of unification by reorganization. I have looked upon the three great questions that must be decided here as being: (1) Some mode by which the constitutionality of the acts of the General Conference might be tested, (2) that there might be given such relative powers to the Regional or Jurisdictional Conferences as might be necessary, and (3) that there should be written in the charter of the reorganized Church something that will protect the minority from the aggressions of the majority, whether that majority be in the North, South, East, or West. I thank God that I am not a citizen of a disrupted republic, that I am not a citizen of a fragment of a continental empire. I thank God for the flag that floats over me, and I believe that the Stars and Stripes is the most beautiful flag that ever floated to the breezes of heaven. But we recognize essentially that there are great experiences through which we have passed and, please God, great lessons that we have learned, and that these Churches, in order to be made one again, must be made one by reorganization. I indorse with all my heart as constituting one of the essential conditions of reunion the fact that there shall be what we are pleased to call Regional Conferences. In the course of the wide range of discussion to which we have listened here for three or four days, no kindly spirited man could fail to be at once thrilled and impressed by the candor and the kindness and the gentleness and the brotherliness and the

strength of the speeches to which he has listened. We are not prepared to follow all the expressions that have been uttered or the implications that would flow from them. I think there have been extreme positions taken, which, of course, were unavoidable. As I look upon it, I see what I believe the logical development of the idealism of Bishop Hamilton would have resulted in, as applied certainly to the civil affairs of our country. I believe it would have left the Southern States from 1865, all of them or most of them, under the control of the negroes. There are two States in the Union to-day that would have negro governors and the civil affairs entirely in the hands of the negroes. I am a citizen of one of those States, and I believe I can say with confidence that there is no man here who would have asked this thing at our hands. So far as the clear, strong, candid statement of Judge White is concerned, I have never in my life been able to look upon that view, which I have heard expressed a thousand times, as holding out any degree of hope for our country. If the negro, no matter how much he may become educated or how thoroughly he becomes Christianized, is never to have participation in the civil affairs of our great republic, then there is no hope for him, and there is no hope for the white man, as long as they stay together. I would believe in colonization or anything short of cruelty that would take us out of as hopeless a situation as that. I cannot take the position that Judge White has taken. I cannot look into the future and see any hope for us and then indorse it. I know he speaks for the section from which he comes and the section from which I come just as Dr. Lamar has given expression to the sentiments that exist so largely in that great block of conservative Southern Methodists. I have refused to become excited over the exodus of the negro to the North. I have not become excited over the fact that some seven or eight hundred thousand negroes within the last eighteen months have gone to the Northern parallels. I believe I can see where some good is coming out of it. I think the Northern white man and the Southern negro will get better acquainted with each other when they look each other in the face; and I think the white man of the North will learn to know more about the virtues and the vices, the gentleness and the greatness, but the backwardness as well, of the negro man than he knew when he stood on the shores of Lake Michigan and looked toward the Gulf and saw the negroes gathered there. I believe the negro is going to learn something, too, as he comes face to face with the vices and virtues of our white citizens of the North. Upon the other hand the Southern white man will be led to appraise more fairly the value of the negro laborer, and will deal more justly with him in the matter of wages, will build better houses in which he is to live and will make more adequate provision for the education of

his children, while the negro, for his part, will learn to appreciate more justly the advantages of the section from which he has gone. Oh, I know you talk about our needing him, Dr. Jones, and we do need him; but I would rather that our fields would lie fallow for a while than that this great problem should remain a sectional problem. We may be mistaken; you think we are and we think you are, and, as Dr. Lamar has said, we think you have idealized the negro man. I want the negro to become scattered over the United States, and I want you people to meet him face to face. I wrote to a friend of mine in Milwaukee the other day who had written me asking what I thought about the negro going to the North, and said that I believed if 50,000 negroes from Mississippi would go into Milwaukee and other parts of Wisconsin, and 50,000 Wisconsin white men would come to their places in Mississippi, it would be a good thing for the negro and for the white man. But in the meantime there are great necessities pressing upon us. I think the solution of our difficulty is to be found in the establishment of a separate Church for the negro. I have never become enthusiastic over the idea of a world Church. I believe in a Church nation-wide in the Church and in the nation; but I believe that if in the providence of God large results should follow upon our missionary labors in China, resulting in many Methodists in China, or if 500,000 Chinese Methodists should reside in the United States, they should be brought into a separate organization. I believe I can see the distinction between drawing racial and color lines in the redemptive purpose of Jesus Christ and the drawing of such lines in the practical administration of the affairs of the Church on earth. I think we should not fail to recognize the fact that there are race differences; and while we would not shut the door of the kingdom of grace and glory in the face of any man or any race, it is simply taking a just view of the practical difficulties that present themselves to us when we say that in the administration of the affairs of the Church of Christ it is necessary for us to take cognizance of racial differences. My objection to the preferential plan or to any plan that would leave the negro in his present relation to the M. E. Church, and which it seems to me would leave out of view entirely that problem which to you may seem to be of no moment; and when I say "you" I mean you brethren of the Northern Church. I think you are looking at the 315,000 members of the M. E. Church. We are not looking at them alone. They are not the only negroes who are in our Southern States. There are millions of them to whom Methodism in the providence of God must carry the religion of Jesus Christ. I do not know how many, but I think there are about 250,000 who have occupied a closer relation to us than all the other negroes in the United States. It may be that you are not

greatly concerned—I know that you are not officially concerned—with them. You are officially concerned with only the 315,000 men represented by Dr. Jones and Dr. Penn, but we do not forget the others; and when we make any sort of adjustment, we must make one that will not make difficult or impossible the coming into this great Methodist fold of these 250,000 people, and we must rather adopt some provision that will make easy the coming into our Church of the African Methodist Church and the Zion Church. There should be a great negro Methodist Church in the United States of America, bound to our white Church by ties that are as strong as the love of God in Jesus Christ, and as helpful as the spirit of the Lord Jesus can make one of one race born of Jesus Christ helpful to a man of another race born by the grace of God into the same blessed relation. I heard read here two or three letters from bishops of negro Churches. I am sorry Dr. Jones got tired as quickly as he did. I would like for him to have read them all. I do not know all that these bishops think; but I believe the adoption of either of the plans presented here will practically close the doors of the M. E. Church in the face of the Colored Methodist Church, the African Methodist Church, and the M. E. Zion Church; and I think we ought to adopt some plan that will open the door to these men, because we then follow what seems to be the natural, logical, and inevitable tendency to organize themselves into one great colored Methodist Church in the United States. I agree most heartily with the suggestion made by Dr. Lamar looking to some temporary arrangement by which there may be drawn closer together these Churches that in the providence of God must come together. I think that door has not always been very wide open. I think it was nearly shut in 1848. I think it was almost closed in the tragedy of 1861-65; but I believe it never was as wide open as it is to-day and that it will never be less open than it is to-day. Whether it is open enough for the great Methodist hosts to sweep through its generous portals, I do not know. But if it is not open quite far enough, brethren, we cannot violently push it open; and I warn you, if it is open, we must not violently close it. Now, with regard to one suggestion by Dr. Lamar a few moments ago. If we reach that *impasse* that he was talking about, I do not think it would be well for the delegates from the M. E. Church, South, in the formulation of this common report to the General Conference to say, "This is our position," and the delegates from the Northern Church to say, "This is our position," because the men of the two Commissions will inevitably make stronger the lines of their own sectional preferences. I think there ought to be submitted a report that will, in the spirit of Christian brotherhood,

lay down in terms that we can all indorse these words that express our divergent views, and that we should place before the General Conferences those responsibilities for final action that are theirs, not ours. When the members of the M. E. Church in the United States and of the M. E. Church, South, feel the responsibility for the opening or the closing of the door of union or their entering or not entering into that which it seems to me in the providence of God must be, they will find themselves not so free to say what they would do or would not do as at this present moment when this responsibility does not rest upon them.

Bishop McDowell: Some of you have read that charming story by Mr. Barrie, "Sentimental Tommy," and you will remember that Tommy stated the experience of many when he said, "It is easy enough to make up your mind when you have only one, but it is a rather different problem when you have two minds and are obliged to make both of them up." My mind works, you may think, a little bit curiously, though I think rather naturally in this business. When my dear friend Dr. Blake tries to hurry me, then I straightway resist being hurried; and when my dear friend Dr. Lamar manifests a spirit to slow me down, then all my desire for speed gets into motion. I am put back in the position, I think, of that well-known explorer whom Bishop McConnell quotes in a most admirable article. He says that when he reaches a certain condition and does not know his way out of a trackless forest, when he is in doubt, he goes ahead. He does not go ahead recklessly, but at least he goes ahead hoping to find his way out. I think we all share what was so kindly, fearlessly, and wisely said by Dr. Lamar as to the uncertainty of the next stop. Brothers, the whole case would have been infinitely easier from the beginning if we had had a perfectly clear path well marked out and a bright light shining upon it; but it belongs to the sons of God like us to have the spirit of exploration even when the light is dim and the path uncertain. It belongs to men who believe in Christ to have faith to go forward. The remedy for an imperfect condition in the kingdom of God is not to return to a less perfect condition, but to get ahead to more perfect conditions. Now, I wonder if we may not quietly recall to ourselves for a moment our position. I wonder if we may not after the discussion has run as far as it has run make an effort to discover where we are, if we cannot take our bearing and consider our instructions in their terms and in their spirit. We are here representing two great Churches which in their highest bodies have adopted certain documents and on the basis of those documents have constituted these Commissions. We are, therefore, not discussing a great question of social or political or reli-

gious interest as a company of gentlemen who might get together and just go over any profound question. We are here with that kind of a question completely before us, but we are here representing two great bodies which have adopted two certain documents. At this moment the whole question of unification is before us in one phase of it, but in the discussion of only one phase of it—namely, the status of the negro. But the whole question is all the time before us. When we are discussing abstractly or largely the question of unification, we have the specific phases of it in our minds, and in discussing that specific phase we have the whole large question on our mind. In other words, it is not just now simply the consideration of the negro in America: it is the consideration of the problem of unification of the two Churches. What are our desires and spirit in this matter? Our desires and spirit are unanimous. We all wish to win the reward that is promised to men who make peace and unity. We do not desire to break up at the end of this session or any other and be known thereafter as sons of the South or sons of the North, but we want to be known hereafter as sons of God who in God's name made peace. That is our general position this morning. That is where for the moment we have come. Now, concretely, the status of the negro is before us; but in our minds all the time also the question of the Regional Conferences is before us. Concretely the status of the negro is before us, but concretely also the status of 325,000 or 350,000 of our negroes, and then in a secondary, but in a real way, other negroes to whom we have a ministry and a relation. But for our legal action the question before us is the status of 325,000 negroes who have a legal relation to one of these bodies. The relation of the other negroes will be determined by a united Church, and it is not before us now for legal action, but only as a missionary consideration which we must never leave out of our purview. There are two fundamental conditions affecting our discussion. There is the Southern situation and there is the Northern situation, and there is exactly the same word to be applied to each. There is a mutual desire—is there not?—to play fair, to see straight, each to see the facts as related to himself and each to see the facts as related to the other. And in this discussion now and hereafter there are to be no suspicions of one another and no recriminations. We are honestly endeavoring, God helping us, to take the facts and conditions and situations that influence us, and without ignoring them to work out of them a new situation and condition that shall be mutually honorable to you and to us and altogether good for the kingdom of Christ. I do not like anything at all in these discussions that looks like emphasis upon what we call "concessions." When we go to balancing our concessions against your concessions, we engage in a practice that is

not very profitable. It does not land us very far forward. It is not a question of concessions now about which I am concerned; it is a question of how far with your conditions and how far with our conditions we can go to reach a basis of mutual coöperation for the common good. And by the common good I mean the whole common good, of course. We are obliged to ask, How many negroes, if any negroes, can we have in the General Conference in the new Church and upon what terms can we have these negroes in whatever numbers they are in the new Church? How can two different bodies with what seem apparently irreconcilable attitudes be made by patience and by kindness and by mutual faith and love to unite at the Cross? How far can we bring ourselves together at that point? Now, brothers, is it necessary for me to say that I do not for one moment mean to intimate that either is farther from the Cross in this matter than the other? I do not seem to say that, do I? I am wanting to say all that I am going to say as I would want to say it if sitting here visibly present were the King and Lord of us all; and I do not want, therefore, even by implication or unkind inference, anybody to think that I am assuming for a moment that you are farther from the Cross of Christ than we are or that we are farther from the Cross than you are. Let us assume that we have but one desire in this business, and that is that the Spirit of Jesus Christ shall govern in this matter and that we shall all have that spirit. For we are building to-day, not for the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, nor the Methodist Episcopal Church—we are building in the stormiest time in the world's history a body which—shall I say it reverently?—Jesus Christ will be able to use or will not be able to use in the hour of the greatest need that he has had since he came to dwell among men in the long gone days. For I do not conceal from myself for one moment, and I would not if I could, that Jesus Christ has a tremendous need of such a body as he wants us to create. And if we fail him now it is a good deal more than a simple failure to reach a verbal agreement; it is a failure which affects and will affect the status, not of the negro, but the status of the kingdom of God in the world. Therefore, do I need to say, we have to approach this whole question in its large and sacramental sense? I will go so far as to say that in my judgment it is acute, it is far-reaching, it is desperate, as it was not five years ago or at least as it did not seem to be five years ago. It is acute, it is significant, it is almost desperate, as it was not when we met at Baltimore. This matter that began by seeming to be a question of the reunion of two denominations separated for historic reasons has come to be a world problem. Yonder in the hotel with me is the wife of my youth who has all the time the burden of the world not only upon her heart

but upon her hands. She came along with me partly to hold me steady, having learned through many years that I need to have such guidance, and I having learned through many years that she can give it to me. Every morning and night she reminds me, playfully often, but always seriously, that the kingdom of Jesus Christ, the whole world among all men and all things and all nations, is involved in what we are doing here in these days; and when she discovers at times signs of irritation on my part over petty matters—and she can easily discover them, because I am a member of this Joint Commission and I partake of the common nature of this body—then she reminds me that no petty irritations and no irritations over petty matters must be allowed to get in the way of the larger interest that affects the kingdom of Christ in all the world. Now, from our side in this matter you understand—and I use that word not offensively—from our side we have to do with our convictions. We have to reckon with our obligations. We have to do and reckon with our relations to our missionary problems in all the world. Your problem on your side is to deal with your convictions and to reckon with your obligations and to reckon with your missionary service and work in all the world. Brethren, we are very far apart in that matter. In the consideration of our problems we have to face first the questions of right that have been long possessed and are now legally possessed by a goodly number of our people. No matter that those people are of a certain color. They did not obtain the right because they were of that color. Their rights are not abridged because they were of that color. Their rights are legal rights and we have to hold all the facts in this case before us. I think we are all prepared to make the distinction. I think Dr. Jones and Dr. Penn have repeatedly assured us that they are prepared to make the distinction between the withdrawal of rights legally possessed and the extension of those rights indefinitely. That is to say that if we have 500,000 or a million or two million or six or eight or ten million negro members who come into the United States hereafter they may come upon terms that are fixed, and no injustice will be done; but there is a clear distinction between depriving persons of rights which they possess and the failure to extend like rights to all others. We have to take account not only of this particular race, but of all the races as has already been done in the report that is presented here. We must have in our discussions our Chinese, our Indians, our Koreans, our Latin-Americans, and our African Christians. If the mass movement in India should get anything like the power it could easily obtain, if it should spread as we believe it would spread if we had a sufficient number of missionaries, it is easily conceivable

that in ten years we would have a million Christians in India in our Church; it is easily conceivable that within the lifetime of men sitting here we might have millions of Christians in India in our Church. Is it not? When that condition is reached, it would be physically and financially impossible to bring to the General Conference in the United States a proportionate representation on the basis of the representation of the Annual Conferences here. But it would be a calamity, in my judgment, brethren, if that great body of Indian Christians and a like body of Chinese Christians were not represented in the Ecumenical General Conference of the Methodist Church by numbers sufficiently strong to constitute a real bond of contact between them and us. I would, therefore, lay out before you this suggestion concretely, that the Regional Conferences organized upon racial lines, upon missionary lines, upon language lines, or upon geographical lines should have a limited but a real representation in the General Conference, limited as to number, but real as to quality. Our present negro membership would, I suppose, be entitled to about five per cent of the whole body, or less, say four per cent. In a General Conference of fifty people two colored persons would sit, just as two such persons have sat in all the sessions of this body. If the number were six hundred people, twenty-five persons would belong to it, just as Dr. Jones and Dr. Penn have in this body. Now, there is a real difference between us at this point. The members of the Southern Commission profoundly and honestly believe that it would be better for the negro to have a perfectly independent and separate General Conference. I do not say that all so believe, but those who hold that view are entitled to hold it without any criticism of the correctness of their judgment in that matter and certainly without any criticism being attached to their purpose in holding that view. On the other hand, there are those of us who feel that we cannot dispossess persons who possess the legal right to representation. And we just as profoundly believe that it is better for them and for us and for that large missionary work that we have in our hearts for the whole world that they should be with us in respectable numbers and in real relation, and if that constitutes—I hesitate to use that French word, for I speak French like a native of Cork—but if that constitutes an irreconcilable matter, that is what it constitutes, of course. But I submit to you that for the larger good, for the larger task that keeps us in relation to the Indians, in relation to the Chinese, in relation to Latin-Americans, in relation to Europe, and I ought to go further and say in relation with Central Europe after the war is over and there shall be no more wars, when the Church of Jesus Christ must refill a broken

world with a spirit of love and not of hate—in that new day the Church of Jesus Christ must have all these persons present in a real relation in such a body as this that we are proposing. And I do not think that with a total representation in the General Conference of ten or twelve or fifteen per cent of the whole body representing all these great areas we would be in any special danger of being swamped or injured. That would obviate and relieve another very difficult point. It would make it possible for us to say that the Regional Conferences should be organized as they ought in reason, and we would not need say that they should be of a certain size. We would not need to discriminate and say that some should be called Regional and some should be called Sub-Regional and all the rest of that. That would enable us also to do the thing that has been suggested here—namely, to propose specifically and in terms that these Regional Conferences that are to be organized on racial or missionary or geographical or language lines should be encouraged by distinct proclamation to look forward to larger self-government and autonomy, a larger exercise of control over the affairs to which they are directly related. I think one mistake that missionaries have made is to retain the parental attitude toward the mission fields after the period when the parental attitude applies. Now, brethren, can you stand for that? Can we stand for less? We are face to face with this Centenary movement—an odd thing, this Centenary movement. Of all the racial mixtures that have ever been known or that ever got going, that missionary movement in our Church was the greatest.

T. N. Ivey: May I ask a question, Bishop McDowell?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Does the speaker submit to a question?

Bishop McDowell: I will submit to all questions on anything at any time.

T. N. Ivey: I did not catch that last statement you made as to the larger place in the future for these Missionary Regional Conferences, and I would like to have that read.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That is not a parliamentary question to have re-read a portion of a speech which a speaker has delivered.

A. F. Watkins: We are now within five minutes of adjourning time, and I move that the time for adjournment be extended until Bishop McDowell completes his remarks.

The motion was seconded.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Taking it as a matter of general consent that Brother Watkins can claim the floor for the purpose, I will put the motion.

A vote being taken, the time was extended.

Bishop McDowell: Now, what is it you desire, Dr. Ivey?

T. N. Ivey: Under an adverse ruling by the Chair I shall have to withdraw it.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Bishop McDowell has the floor.

Bishop Atkins: I do not see why Dr. Ivey cannot have something read if he desires it and if Bishop McDowell consents.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): It was simply a question of order—

Bishop Atkins: It was for Bishop McDowell to decide whether he would have it read or not.

Bishop McDowell: I shall be glad to have anything I have said read by the Reporter.

(Thereupon the portion of Bishop McDowell's remarks referred to by Dr. Ivey were read by the Reporter.)

Bishop McDowell: I think it was at the point where I just said that we are face to face with this great missionary centenary movement which puts at once into our hearts to make arrangements for a perfectly prodigious movement and effort in the way of common coöperation. We are face to face with the illustrious past in the way of missionary endeavor. A hundred years of missionary history lie behind us now, and what lies ahead of us God only knows. Every once in a while men ask me what is the outlook for this and that, and men are sometimes surprised that I have apparently so little anxiety for certain outlooks. This is my anxiety, brothers, and I will not now use the plural term in speaking of my anxiety. This is my anxiety that our Church of Jesus Christ, our common Church of Jesus Christ, shall not fail Jesus Christ just now. What kind of Christianity is going to be in the world after the war is a mighty serious question. We cannot go on in the world repeating worn-out phrases from which evidently everything has gone; we cannot hang on to worn-out forms because our fathers used them. Our concern to-day and to-morrow is not half so much about our fathers as it is about our sons, the sons of God in the whole world who have the strongest mixing up that has taken place on the planet, when men from everywhere, from Europe, Asia, and Africa, have been thrown together to fight and to live and to die. We have to face realities that the conventional life of ten years ago did not have to face, and it will take a real Christianity to face them. A conventional Christianity will be as inadequate as anything that could be imagined. It is going to take a real Church of Jesus Christ to maintain itself. The other day in a private conversation, speaking of a certain branch of the Church, an English officer said: "I have an impression that in a good many respects the

Church has missed the bus and failed to get on." This is intolerable. The whole life of Christianity is involved here. We are facing concretely the question of the unification that we are sent to accomplish, and all such reorganization as may be necessary to reach that unification. We have to distinguish between some of these movements for reorganization and some others that seem to look toward reorganization, but do not look toward unification particularly. There will be reorganizations not only between these two Churches sitting here this morning, but there will be a unification between other Churches and these, and other Churches than these that are lying before us on this table. There is not a particle of question about that. No man can face the world at the present time without coming in contact with a good many things that have not heretofore been appreciated. Men are asking now whether we are not setting supreme store upon and laying undue stress and emphasis upon a lot of absolutely minor matters. They are asking us whether we are prepared to stand up and look Jesus Christ in the face and say, "Master, whithersoever Thou goest, I will follow Thee." We are face to face with a new work in which we cannot lay emphasis upon sectionalism, no matter what kind, whether Northern or Southern sectionalism. We are in a world in which we cannot lay emphasis upon Nationalism in the exaggerated sense that has broken the peace and now threatens the liberty of the world. Germany is not to have a place in the sun as a nation any more than Great Britain, to the exclusion of all others, so that they must stand in the shade. Humanity is the only thing that has got to have a place in the sun. The sun shines for humanity, and we are face to face here to-day with the question of what we will do for that larger life and for that newer day for humanity. So I say, brothers, then, at last, that I hope that we may have here the spirit of faith and the spirit of the pioneer. We do not get out of our difficulties by a smaller life; we get out of our perplexities by a larger life, and only by a larger life. And the time is short. I do not mean by that to state any notion with reference to any theological view, but this I say, "The time is short"—short for me and short for you and short for us all; and it is for us, God helping us, to put our hands, and the hands of all humanity through us, into the hands of the Lord of all humanity and see what we can do to lift the whole world and bind it in every way by gold chains about the feet of God. Brothers, the redemptive movement of Christianity hangs in the balance. It is for us to put our weight in the right place.

The hymn, "Praise God, from whom all blessings flow," was sung, and the session closed with a benediction by Bishop McDowell.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The session was called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Collins Denny.

Dr. John F. Goucher conducted the devotional exercises.

The hymn, "My faith looks up to Thee," was sung.

Dr. Goucher read Philippians ii.

The hymn, "Guide me, O thou great Jehovah," was sung and Dr. Goucher offered prayer.

The roll was called, and the following were present: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke, Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. B. Murrah, Jame Atkins. Ministers: Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. W. Van Cleve, J. J. Wallace, F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar; Rev. C. M. Stuart, reserve. Laymen: G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, G. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, H. W. Rogers, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock, M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White.

The minutes of the morning session were read and approved.

E. B. Chappell: Permit me to begin my discussion with a brief confession. Although I have always regarded the reunion of the sundered branches of American Methodism as a consummation to be devoutly desired, until the meeting of our General Conference in 1914 I had taken but little interest in active measures for unification. Indeed, I am quite sure that if I had been approached on the subject five years ago, I should have declared myself opposed to any immediate steps looking to that end. The reason I should have taken this position was that I did not at that time believe that real unification was possible. But then, a report signed by such wise and conservative leaders as Bishops Wilson, Hoss, and Denny, suggesting a basis of unification which was declared to be both possible and desirable, was presented to our General Conference, and when I discovered upon investigation that a large majority of the members of the General Conference were enthusiastically in favor of the plan of unification set forth in this report, I decided that I had been mistaken, that the sentiment was much stronger and more general than I had supposed. It is needless to say that I hailed this discovery with gratitude, and that because of it I gave my hearty assent to the action of our Conference which resulted two years later in the creation of this Joint Commission. Having done so and having accepted membership on the Commission, I

regard myself as in duty bound to do everything I can to bring about the accomplishment of the purpose for which the Commission was created. I am glad that in this case my official responsibility is in complete accord with my conviction of what is best for our country and for the world, a conviction which has been immensely strengthened by the tragic events that have come since this Commission began its work. I believe profoundly that in order to meet the staggering responsibilities which are just before us, Episcopal Methodism in America ought to be able to present a united front at this great crisis in the world's history. The tragic cataclysm which we are now witnessing is breaking up the social and economical structures which we have been slowly building through the years. Social life in all its manifold aspects will have to be reorganized when this war is over. The big question for our country, for civilization, is, What are to be the dominating forces in this reorganization? Are they to be the Christ Spirit and the principles of the Christian message, or are they to be the teachings of the Anarchistic Socialism of Karl Marx or maybe of the wild revolutionary Socialism of the Russian Bolsheviki? The answer to this question will be largely with the Church, and for this answer Methodism, representing the strongest branch of American Evangelical Christianity, will have to fill those of responsibility. And in order to meet this responsibility in the most effective way the forces must be united. This is no time to be wasting means and energy in useless overlapping and unseemly competition. We need to stand together for common aims and ideals. At a time when our government is experiencing such serious difficulty because of the incongruous elements which make up our population, we need to stand, not for the exaggeration and perpetuation of sectional differences, but for a broad nationalism in which, along with such diversity as is a necessary result of untrammelled opportunity for the development of local individuality, there shall be real fundamental unity. I am a Southern man with almost three hundred years of Southern ancestry behind me. My English forbears settled on the James River in Virginia in 1635. Naturally, I love the South with a peculiarly tender devotion, and I sincerely desire to see what is best in our Southern life preserved. But I do not want to preserve it for a process of semi-isolation. I want the South to be a vital part of our common country, showing whatever intellectual wealth she may possess with all other sections and at the same time enriching her life by availing herself of the benefits that are to be derived from sharing the life of other sections. May I add that I believe that for these two great Churches just now to reconcile their differences and unite their forces for the accomplishment of

the big tasks that call them would be a mighty stimulus to the faith and hope and courage of the nation. Men of other communions, many of them, have expressed to me the ardent wish that we may find a way to come together. Such a consummation would prove that Methodism still deserves to be characterized as "Christianity in earnest" and would be an unmistakable manifestation of our determination at whatever cost to gird ourselves for the great task that is before us. It seems to me that the call to unite is clear and imperative. I turn over to the matter immediately before us—namely, the place of the negro in our reunited Methodism. I trust it is needless for me to proclaim my deep interest in the welfare of the negro and my earnest desire to do what is best for him. That ought to be assumed. There is no difference between the representatives of the two Churches on the Commission upon this point. We of the South do not have to be besought by our brethren from the North to treat the negro fairly and justly. The differences between us, if there are differences, arise when we seek to determine what is best for him and what justice toward him requires. Frankly, I am not satisfied with the relation of my own Church to the colored people. We all know that the wise men who led in our General Conference in 1866 did not mean to have it so. They wanted to put the negroes in a separate organization—not in a separate Church—with their own General Conference, which should be related to the General Conference of the white people as the Annual Conferences are related one to another. That is, they want one Church with two closely related and coöperating jurisdictions. And they even went so far as to take action which looked to inviting the African Methodist Episcopal Church to unite with this composite Church. But at that time our colored people were intoxicated with their new liberty which had been thrust upon them and they were bent on asserting their freedom in every way possible. They insisted on being set off in an independent Church, and to this insistence our fathers were compelled to yield. The plan has not been auspiciously successful. It has failed to bring the white and colored Methodists of the South into that kind of Christian coöperation which we regard as desirable. It is generally concluded that as the years have gone by we have drifted farther apart instead of coming closer together. Our colored people do not look to us for sympathy and help as they did thirty years ago. The plan has failed also to awaken that kind of interest among our own people which expresses itself in effective constitutive action. I have talked for twenty-five years with intelligent white men of the South about our obligation to the negroes. Everywhere I have found a genuine longing to help them. And

yet we have all been smitten with a sense of comparative impotence. We have preached for them when we were permitted to do so. We have assisted them without stint in their local enterprises; but, as for any far-reaching plan for helping them to work out their destiny, we have not had it. For many years succeeding the close of the War between the States we had an excuse in our dire poverty for doing but little. Our land lay desolate, our property was gone, and the finest of our manhood slept in blood-soaked battle fields. But that excuse exists no longer. Prosperity beyond anything we could have hoped has come to us. And yet, somehow, we find ourselves unable to do what we should like to do for our colored neighbors. The point of contact is lacking. The interest of our people is too diffused and general to be practically operative. That there is a real interest among intelligent Southern people in the negro is shown by the fact that in practically all Southern States negroes share equally with whites in proportion to population in public school funds. Most Southern States are supporting by taxation common schools, normal schools, and industrial schools for the negroes. I recognize the fact, however, that this does not discharge the obligation of the Church. While the State is efficient industrially, the Church must see to it that they become more Christian. Whatever, therefore, may be the outcome of these negotiations, I feel that the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, must manage somehow to come into a closer and more vital relation with the negro. He needs our help in working out his social destiny and we must learn how to help him. Having spoken with frankness of the present relation of my own Church to the negro, may I be permitted to speak with equal candor of the relation in which the Methodist Episcopal Church has attempted and is still attempting to hold him? The record of your efforts in behalf of the negro cannot be too highly commended. You have poured out money by the million and you have given unstinted service. And, of course, your labor in the Lord has not been in vain. Untold benefits have come to the negro and to the nation as the result of your sacrifices. And yet, I must be pardoned for expressing the belief that the problem whose solution you are seeking can never be solved in the way you are going about it. When you began your work in the South at the close of the War between the States, there seemed to be every prospect that you would soon capture the whole body of the Methodist negroes. You were from the North, you were the people who had emancipated them from slavery, and you came offering them your money, your friendship, your Christian culture. If I had been on the ground at the time, I would have prophesied that within two decades you would have won prac-

tically all of them. And yet, as a matter of fact, after the passage of almost six decades you have but a little more than 300,000 out of 1,800,000 of the Methodist negroes of the entire country. What is the matter? Why such comparatively small returns for such immense outlay in money and service? The answer seems to me quite apparent. Your plan necessarily keeps the negro in a position of dependence and subordination in a predominantly white Church. You did not originally mean that it should be so. You honestly tried to keep from drawing the color line, but you could not help it. And the negroes of the South understand what the actual situation is, and hence, notwithstanding your noble generosity, have steadfastly refused except in an indirect way to avail themselves of your proffered help. They feel somehow that they cannot, under such a relation as exists between the negroes and the whites in your Church, find that freedom which they desire in working out their social destiny. I do not believe, therefore, that by your present plan you will ever succeed in reaching the great masses of our American negroes. May I further call attention to the fact that your plan involves factors that must necessarily prove the occasion of future misunderstandings? It is well known that there has already been unrest among the negroes of your Church; that unrest is sure to increase with the increase of your negro membership in numbers and intelligence. Indeed it is probable that your success in dealing with your negro membership has been in direct proportion to your failure in winning the negroes to your fellowship. Suppose the two millions of Methodist negroes had united with the Methodist Episcopal Church, as it seemed fifty years ago they would be likely to do. Is it not apparent that the Church to-day would have had upon its hands a problem which would have sorely taxed the wisdom of its leaders? Brethren, we cannot afford to establish any relation between ourselves and our colored fellow Christians to which we could not receive all the negroes of the country if they should desire to unite with us. We have heard much recently about the danger of exaggerated race consciousness. The danger is real, and we must seek in every possible way to overcome it. But we are not going to overcome it by ignoring or attempting to destroy racial differences. We could not accomplish the latter if we would, and we should not if we could. We would be immeasurably impoverished and the outlook for civilization immeasurably reduced if all the races of the earth were blended into one. Belated as the negro race is, I believe it has an important contribution to make to the sum total of the spiritual resources of the world, a contribution which no other race can make, and, therefore, I do not want to see it absorbed in any other race. The task of the Church is so to

fill the differing races with the spirit and ideals of the gospel that they shall be able, while each continues to maintain its own identity, to live together in peace and coöperation in all good works. The negro occupies a peculiar place in our American life. With minor exceptions the remainder of our heterogeneous population is thoroughly Aryan, Anglo-Saxon, German, Celtic, Latin, Slav, and belong to the same great racial stock. But when we come to the negro we have a race differing radically from that to which we belong. So when we begin to deal with the negro there comes into play what I believe to be a divinely implanted instinct of race self-preservation. We should have the same phenomenon and practically the same problem if we had among us ten million Japanese or Chinese. The fact that the negro belongs to a retarded race and that he has only recently emerged from slavery may exaggerate the feeling of horror with which we regard the prospect of racial blending, but it does not create it. Indeed, Dr. Jones assured us in his speech on Saturday that the negro feels very much as we do about it. In the absence of intelligent Christian direction this blind instinct of race self-preservation takes the form of antagonism which often degenerates into race hatred. And it is this that we want to overcome. We want to lead the white race and the negro race to live together in peace, respecting one another, helping one another in every way possible, coöperating in the great common task of building up a triumphant kingdom of God on the earth and yet maintaining its racial separateness. In order to accomplish this we must do everything in our power to establish such relations between them in the Church as will prevent friction and cultivate mutual confidence and respect. It is not a question of inferiority or superiority on the part of one race or the other, but a question of pursuing racial integrity and allowing each race to work out its own destiny, while at the same time cultivating mutual love and trust and the spirit of coöperation. Let us, in the light of these suggestions, examine the two plans submitted to us by our committee. The first proposes to put the negro members of the Methodist Episcopal Church into a Sub-Regional or Associate Regional Conference with a limited representation in the General Conference. There are several serious objections, it seems to me, to this plan: (1) It would hold the negro in a place of subordination in a predominantly white Church. It makes a kind of ward of him and places upon him the unmistakable mark of dependence. And because of this it fails to give him the opportunity which he ought to covet and to which he is entitled of working out with the help of his brethren and yet in his own way his destiny. (2) Any plan which we work out here ought to provide for a

possible union of the negro Methodisms of America. It certainly must provide for the early coming in of that branch of negro Methodism to which we of the Church, South, are most closely related, the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church. But I am quite certain that no independent negro Methodist Church would even consent to unite with us on such a basis as this plan proposes. (3) The plan would open the way for the very kind of race friction and antagonism which we are seeking to avoid. For, suppose the time should come when the negroes, having reached the required standard as to membership, should ask for recognition as a Regional Conference on a parity with other Regional Conferences, what answer should we give them? If it were a negative one, you can readily see what the result would be. If, on the other hand, we should grant the request, it is perfectly apparent that we should introduce into the Church a race problem more perplexing and dangerous than any we have hitherto known. (4) In the light of these facts, no further argument is needed to show that this plan would leave wide open the way to serious controversy and division in our own ranks. Are we not wise enough to devise some plan that shall hold us together in one great fellowship without involving all these difficulties and dangers? It seems to me that we have at least the basis of such a plan in the Associate General Conference suggested by the alternative purpose of our committee. I am not yet ready to commit myself to all its details, but the main feature of the plan strikes me as both reasonable and feasible: (1) The plan does not turn the negro out of the Church, as Dr. Jones seems to assume. On the contrary, it keeps him in the Church, and that upon conditions that carry with them no suggestion of dependence and subordination and require no surrender of self-respect. A Methodism in Japan or China or India or Latin America or Europe could afford to accept such a relation without any sacrifice or racial pride or respect. For the plan, as I understand it, simply provides for separating Methodism into closely related and coöperating sections on the basis of racial differences and needs. If our colored friends insist that any arrangement which recognizes them as negroes is a discrimination and a humiliation, I have only to remind them that such a position implies a lack of racial self-respect of which no race ought to be guilty. A Japanese or a Chinese or a Korean never objects to being reminded that he is such. He is proud of it, and he ought to be. (2) The plan makes it possible to provide for co-operation without involving those dangers of friction and misunderstanding which are involved in the preferential plan. (3) The plan can be so modified as to leave each race free to develop its racial traits and fulfill its racial destiny without being

hampered by the other. It makes it possible that there shall develop side by side in this country a white Methodism and a negro Methodism, each helping and respecting the other and each making its own peculiar contribution to the spiritual wealth of the world and to the common task of the Church of God on the earth. (4) It opens up the way for the settlement of other race problems that are sure to emerge as Methodism grows in foreign fields. We have already encountered a race problem in Japan and it has forced us to set the Japanese Methodists off in an independent Church. We shall have a similar problem in India by and by, and in China and Korea, and I trust in South America. The Associate General Conference seems to me to furnish the best way yet suggested for meeting this demand for racial recognition and opportunity. We do not want to keep the races converted through our preaching and teaching in perpetual subordination. On the contrary, it should be our aim, while continuing to assist them and counsel them as we may, to grant them, when the time is ripe, full freedom to develop each under the impulse of its own racial traits, and so to make each its own special racial contribution to the religious thought and life of the world. Toward such a destiny, it seems to me, we should seek to divert the development of Methodism.

J. H. Reynolds: I find myself in perfect sympathy with our good friend Dr. Lamar in at least one thing. He expressed a faith that we would sooner or later have united Methodism. I differ from him, however, as to the time when that shall come. I have the fullest faith that our counsels here will result in a united Methodism. I have that faith, not as a blind fatalist, believing that God, independent of what men may do, will lead us. I have that faith because I see, as I understand it, God leading us strongly in the direction of unification of Methodism; and, secondly, I find man making most earnest efforts toward the realization of the same end, and I believe, Dr. Lamar, that the two working together will find a solution at this time, and not a quarter of a century from now. I believe the problem before us is largely a question of adjustment, of social mechanics. When our fathers in 1787 faced the question of a constitution for this country, their problem was not to create a national life; that life already existed. Their problem was merely to create a channel through which that national life could express itself. Our task here is not to create a life for united Methodism; that life exists, and we see a good many evidences of it. Our task is merely to find the machinery through which it can manifest itself. And I am sincerely of the belief that if we fail it will be because we ourselves as Commissioners of these two Churches fail to adjust ourselves to the

facts of the situation or because we magnify matters of mere expediency into questions of principle. Just what in brief is the difference between our two positions? But I believe, before taking up that point, I shall raise the question as to the seriousness of our failing to solve the problem before us. I tremble in the presence of that responsibility. May I illustrate by referring to two instances where our fathers failed to adjust themselves to the facts before them and to the consequences of their failure? Our people in the South in 1861 through their leaders failed to adjust themselves to a great world situation. They failed to take into account a movement which had been in progress for over seventy-five years, a movement toward humanity, toward democracy, toward the realization and recognition of the rights of man. The tragic consequences of the Civil War were the result at least in part of their failure of adjustment—I do not say that there were no mistakes on the other side: I am speaking here of the South only. But, may I not suggest that our good friends of the North from 1867 to 1874 failed in reconstruction measures to adjust themselves to fundamental racial facts, to fundamental historical situations, to fundamental social conditions, and that their failure brought about the tragic series of events that defeated the very objects they had in mind and has produced such an abnormal situation, part of which we are facing to-day? Serious were the consequences in both instances of their not facing the real facts of the situation and dealing with them on that basis. Now, on the pending question, the status of the colored man in the reunited Church, What is the position of our two Churches? The Church, South, says that we recommend the setting apart of the colored man into an independent Church with fraternal relations; our good brethren of the M. E. Church favor the organization of the colored people into a Regional Conference with representation in the General Conference. Now, if each of these two propositions be in the nature of the last word, we, of course, might as well adjourn and go home. But I raise the question whether or not we are prepared to say the last word in these negotiations, and whether both of us may not be in the wrong, whether each of us has not been brought into our present situation by historical circumstances over which neither had control and whether each may be defending a position upon which he would in reversed positions change his attitude. Take the Church, South. We are championing the principle of independent Churches for the two races because of historical facts over which we had no control. We found ourselves in 1870 with a colored membership reduced from about 200,000 to about 70,000, and we had no other alternative than to set the colored

membership up in an independent Church, however much we might have desired a different relationship. And are we satisfied with that condition? I cannot go into any group of Southern Methodist ministers and talk five minutes on the colored question that I do not hear from all sides expressions to the effect that we are not doing anything like our duty and that we are seeking and longing for some channel whereby we can deliver the moral and spiritual powers of the Southern Church in the solution of this problem. I believe, therefore, that we are in a position that we ourselves do not want, and that we desire it altered. May I ask if the M. E. Church does not occupy a position forced on it by history, and if it may not have wrong ideas of the problem growing out of that distant view of the question incident to having to deal with it at long range, and whether you would not desire to change that relationship in order that you might make more powerful your message to these people? You, yourselves, say you are not satisfied, that you do not believe the results of your labors are commensurate with the efforts you are putting forth. I believe, therefore, that we can both face this question with the thought that neither of us has found a solution for the problem. I have held a number of conferences with colored preachers this fall in various cities and towns of my State. I will just give a few observations as they come to me as the result of these conferences. I have found the colored ministers of the M. E. Church and of the C. M. E. Church somewhat more hospitable in their attitude toward the white man and more ready to receive suggestions and counsel. I found on the part of the members of the African M. E. Church and the African M. E. Zion Church what might be called a poisoned state of mind toward the white man. I will give an extreme statement by one of them to illustrate what I mean. In one of these conferences one man said to me: "We have neither faith in your humanity nor your Christianity," referring to the white man. Of course, that is extreme; and yet it shows that there is dynamite in the situation and it suggests to me that all the Christian Churches in America ought to draw closer to the colored man, and I believe that conviction is deepening in the Southern M. E. Church. Now, as to the concrete plans before us, I favor the second rather than the first plan—that is, I prefer that the negro be set up in a separate General Conference. I shall not enter into a discussion of it, as my friend and colleague Dr. Chappell has so ably presented the case, and I adopt that part of his speech as my own, but may I add one or two suggestions? First, the plan of an Associate General Conference for the colored people does not introduce any new principle into either Church. Your Church has colored mem-

bers organized in separate colored congregations, served by separate colored pastors, meeting in separate Quarterly, District, and Annual Conferences, but coming together with you in the General Conference. Our Church has extended that principle of separation up to the General Conference. There is no difference in principle between us; it is only a question of degree. When you separated them into separate congregations and Annual Conferences you did it on what ground? Surely on the ground of expediency—no other ground. And when we separated them and extended that separation up to the General Conference, we did it on what ground? Expediency. So, I say there is so difference between us as far as principle is concerned. Some people have thought that in this separation as made by both of us, differing only in degree, manhood rights were involved, that humanity was involved. Some have suggested that we people of the South worship a tribal God and have a tribal religion. Nothing of the kind. I believe that every Southern man, especially every Southern Methodist man, believes in according to the colored man in the Church full manhood rights and full human rights. When we suggest that he be organized into a separate Church or a separate General Conference, is there any failure to recognize his manhood rights? He will have full legislative rights and full administrative rights there, rights which he does not now possess in the M. E. Church; and no one is more conscious of the limitations imposed upon the colored members of the M. E. Church than are these colored men present. All of us recognize it. I, therefore, insist that there is no difference in principle between us. It is a difference that has been brought about merely by considerations of expediency; and if we fail in these negotiations, I submit that the failure will not be because of any difference in principle. We are agreed on the universality of our gospel; we are agreed on the brotherhood of man and that the message of God must go to all men and that we are all brothers alike—we are agreed on fundamentals; and so I repeat that if we fail, it will be on matters of expediency, on merely a question of church mechanics, on a question of what is the most effective organization for delivering the full power of the Church. I also favor the second plan, especially because of the reason urged by Dr. Chappell that it will afford a working basis for uniting all colored Methodists. I shall not discuss that, because he presented it so forcibly. But I am reminded by our friend Judge Rogers that without some representation in the General Conference accorded to your colored members your Church would vote the proposition down. I might remind the Judge that with representation of the colored man in the General Conference we have the same situation in our Church—

namely, the imperiling of the chances of the adoption of the plan. But here is a question of expediency, no question of principle being involved. It is, therefore, a legitimate subject of compromise. May I ask the question—and in doing so, I am speaking solely for myself; I have not consulted the Southern Commissioners—Suppose the Southern members could see their way clear to accept your suggestion of a colored Regional Conference with a limited representation in the General Conference as a temporary bridge leading to Associate General Conference relationship, are the Commissioners of the M. E. Church prepared to safeguard those limitations by constitutional restrictions which would prevent the majority later changing them without the consent of the Southern branch of the Church? May I ask further if, when the membership in one of these Associate Regional Conferences, whether in China or America, reaches a certain number, say half a million, you are ready to provide in the constitution for the question of altering their situation and relations to be brought up and let the Church at that time determine in a constitutional way whether or not they shall continue in an Associate Regional Conference relationship or shall become an Associate General Conference or enter some new relationship that may suggest itself at the time?

H. M. Du Bose: You said “independent Church.” What did you mean exactly?

Bishop McDowell: It was perfectly clear.

J. H. Reynolds: Let me remind you again that we are dealing with a question of expediency and not a question of principle. Our hearts beat in common for the colored man, and each of us is ready to do his full measure of duty, and no one, either North or South, would take from the colored man one single manhood or human right. In conclusion, permit me to ask some questions, and will each member of the Commission make the question personal to himself? Let us come into close quarters with the question before us. Are we, as Commissioners, going to magnify a mere question of expediency in Church organization into a principle? Is either Commission prepared to assume before the bar of God and of history the responsibility of defeating unification on a mere matter of social mechanics when no principle is involved? Is the Church, South, prepared to let the negotiations fail merely because the Methodist Episcopal Church finds herself unable to set off her colored members into an independent organization, when we, under the plan of independent racial Churches, are doing but little for the negro and when there is a growing number of our people who feel that we ought to have an organic relation to the colored people? Is the Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church prepared to

imperil the negotiations by insisting upon its present plan of organization when it is confessedly unsatisfactory to its colored members and when a large number of its members believe that the negro should have an independent Church or an Associate General Conference? Does this difference of opinion within each Commission not suggest modesty on the part of each in urging its views? Indeed, is it not wise that each confess it has not found a solution for the problem and that each should yield enough to enable us to find a common ground on which we can stand? Are we, as commissioners, going to report to our respective General Conferences failure on the negotiations because neither Commission can get what its General Conference suggested as desirable, or are we, in the spirit of Christian accommodation, going to work out the nearest approach to what our respective Churches desire and report the same back to our respective General Conferences for their judgment and determination? Are we, as Commissioners from the Church, South, in insisting upon independent Church organization on the basis of race, facing the question in the light of the new age into which we are entering? Are we remembering in this debate the great distance which the world has traveled since our General Conference met in 1914, the immense distance on the road to the oneness and the solidarity of man? how, in the war's hot melting pot, nations and races are being fused and how the world is coming into possession of a new soul, a soul which is emphasizing human as well as race consciousness? Are we keeping in mind as we deliberate here that it is America through her great President that is clarifying the international thinking of the world, is interpreting the highest ideals and aspirations of mankind and the universal elements in our Christian civilization, and is leading the world into an international Christian order, which proposes to safeguard the right and liberties of nations and races both great and small? If and when we have worked out a plan the nearest approach to the wishes of our respective Churches, are we going to refuse them the privilege of voting on it merely because it does not represent exactly what they suggested, or shall we transmit it to our respective General Conferences with or without recommendation and let them assume the responsibility for the final decision? Are we going to let pass the opportunities of the two Churches joining hands in an effort to solve the greatest home mission problem of the nation, that of the negro? I close by suggesting the following proposal: (1) That provision be made in the constitution for limited representation in the General Conference for Regional Conferences based on racial, geographical, and linguistic lines. (2) That provision be made that this relation cannot be altered except by constitu-

tional process. (3) That when any such regional jurisdiction increases in membership to, say, a half million, the question shall be raised in a constitutional way whether the constitutional status of said jurisdiction shall be altered, whether by constitutional process it shall continue its old relation, or shall become an Associate General Conference, or shall sustain some other relation that experience may suggest as wise at the time.

Bishop Leete: This is a beautiful day, and it is so charming on the outside that I feel myself in the position of the boy in school where they were required to spell, define, and use various words propounded by the teacher. This lad was asked to spell and define and use the word "ferment." He spelled it correctly and he defined it as "to work." And then the teacher said, "Give us some proper use of the word," and he said, "Well, I think I would rather be playing out in the street than 'fermenting' inside of a schoolhouse." With reference to all these pertinent and valuable questions going to the very root of the whole matter, I hope that we are not in the position of the Judge who asked the culprit before the bench how he was able to get those chickens when the man was sleeping right by the side of the chicken coop, and he replied: "Now, Jedge, I ain't going to give you the benefit of forty years' experience for nothin', and besides, Jedge, it won't do you no good nohow. If youse gwine engage in any scalawag business, you had better stick to the bench, whar you am familiar." The Judge's desire was not gratified, and we may find ourselves in the same predicament, though I hope not, as to the answer to many of these questions that have come to us. I might give an *apologia pro vita sua*, if I had a desire for anything of that sort, but I believe I ought rather to give an *apologia pro vita mia*. I was brought up in the South. I played with boys there who belonged to an ancestry partly different from my own and only partly different from my own, for, as a matter of fact, my family was represented on both sides of the Great Divide. Members of our family lived in Georgia and in Alabama as well as in the North. I love the South because I learned to know it as a child. After I had been away from the Southern country for a good many years, I was in a park in Brooklyn one day in the dead of winter when it was a good deal below zero outside and ice everywhere. I entered the conservatory and walked perhaps three feet when suddenly the sensitive nerves of my nostrils were affected by a penetrating odor. I whirled around as if I had been struck by a bullet, for it was the first time in years that I had smelled that odor, and I saw the little yellow jasmine flower which I knew so well near Charleston, forty years ago. I was South in the late reconstruction period; and though scarcely more than a boy, I was an observer of many of the things described here. I saw them with

eyes as bright as a man's eyes, and without the prejudice older people have. I saw no great differences in the boys with whom I mingled, and I remember that they saw very little difference in one another. The boys didn't have the deep-seated prejudices that have been running all through the experiences of so many lives. They met together on common ground. That was almost true of both black and white. Within the last few weeks, I met a colored man who accosted me, and I didn't recognize him until he reminded me of his name. It was the name of a lad I knew down in our section of the country and with whom, with all the white boys there, I used to play in the old South Carolina home on about the same terms. I have been spending some years working in the South, and I have been trying to be helpful to anybody that I could aid. I have greatly enjoyed the association of the people with whom I have mingled. I have also greatly enjoyed the discussions of this body from the beginning until now, and more so from the fact that they have been so refreshingly open, so perfectly candid, and so thoroughly sincere. I find myself agreeing in my heart, certainly with Dr. Lamar's statement about our negotiations. On the other hand, I find myself believing absolutely in the justice of his view concerning matters as being matters of fact in this Southern country. I find myself also understanding perfectly well that Judge White has represented facts and conditions which are unquestionable, concerning which there can be no doubt on the part of those who know the truth about it. I find myself in sympathy with a member who has deplored the possibility of any kind of coming together which might conceivably drive us farther apart, and might conceivably injure some of our brothers, whether the weakest or the strongest. For myself, for twenty-five years I have been trying to get people into the Church, and I do not desire now in any way to get them out of it. Yet I say that, with perfect accordance with the suggestion of Dr. Lamar, there is an irreducible minimum of people that we have to put out of the reckoning in any negotiations which may occur. I have been thinking, as we have all been thinking, of the fact that there are many opinions on these matters that have been presented, and that there are differences of opinion, in both of our Churches. There are some members of our own Church who do not hesitate to take the position which has been expressed by a very few of our brothers. On the other hand, there are many members of the Church, South, who have expressed to me and to other members of our Commission views rather more liberal with reference to these particular matters which have been presented here than those entertained by various other members of the Southern Commission. You all understand that there is a diversity of judgment and opinion on the part of both our peo-

ples. The matter I have in my own mind is, in the first place, concerning Brother Reynolds' suggestion. I perfectly like his spirit in arguing this profound question. I do not know whether the members of our own Commission would follow me in the thing I am going to say, but I am thoroughly a believer in democracy, that so far as I personally am concerned I would be perfectly willing to make an arrangement which would leave open the possible resumption of a discussion of the relations of the different races in the years to come, not simply once, but several times, if there should be such an increase in the numerical representation of any kind as some of you seem to think there will be. I believe in democracy, and I do not believe there should be any constitutional *impassé* upon the discussion of a question of Christian progress, Christian peace, or successful Christian relationship. I believe that at all times those matters ought to be perfectly possible of new adjustments, as well as of any possible ultimate final settlement. I do not know whether that answers one of his questions or not, but it answers it from my own standpoint. I would not personally object to having a reopening of the question under certain conditions in the years to come, no matter what finality we might absolutely or tentatively agree to at the present moment. Now, I wish to call the attention of every one here to a fact which you perfectly well know, merely as a matter of gathering up the information in these discussions at this point, that in the other Churches in this Southern country which are strictly Southern Churches the negro enjoys an intimate Christian relationship. I hold in my hand letters from pastors of three strictly Southern Churches. There is one from a representative of a Protestant Episcopal Church, one from a representative of a Southern Presbyterian Church, and the third from a representative of a Southern Baptist Church, and these brethren state exactly the position of the negro in their ecclesiastical organizations. I think I will read a section or two from each to get it before our thinking. For example, the pastor who represents the Protestant Episcopal Church says:

They are a part of the diocese and meet with us in the annual councils, and have all the privileges of the whites, save that in social matters, for example, they never show up, though the invitations are general. A negro would sit without question in General Conventions, if elected. A diocese, and a Southern one at that, once sent one. The diocese of Arkansas has just elected the first colored bishop. He is called "Bishop Suffragan," and assigned special work, just as white Suffragans are, under a general law.

The Presbyterian pastor says:

While we have separate Synods and separate Presbyteries for the negroes, all their ministers do not belong to these courts. Some of them

hold membership in the white Presbyterian Synods. Negro Commissioners, representing various Presbyteries, are members of the General Assembly. One feature of special interest is the maintenance in many places of negro Sunday schools taught by white teachers. The Central Church of Atlanta maintains a school of this kind.

The Baptist representative says:

There is decidedly a friendly spirit of coöperation between the white and negro pastors. We frequently meet in joint conference. Two or three years ago we had a series of meetings held in my church, and white and negro men participated equally upon the program each day. Soon after the Civil War the Baptists of the North began educational work among the negroes of the South, and have a chain of schools from Virginia to Texas. Locally, these schools have the hearty coöperation of the white pastors.

The sole point I wish to make with reference to these letters, and the fact that they contain, is that should we in the reunited Church take our negroes into the relationship that we are asking, it would not be out of harmony with what has obtained in all the other strictly Southern Churches, so far as I know, though there may be some Church of which I do not know anything. I do not base this on my own testimony, but on the testimony of men whose names would be approved by the members of both Commissions who are here if I should give them. I have also in my hand a card which I received since I came here from Atlanta, asking me for a contribution to the new negro association building. I happened to glance at that, and it shows that it is sent out by Col. Lowry, or at least he is one of those who send it out. He is head of the great Lowry bank, a man whose Southern standing and character are beyond question from any man. This is the statement at the head of that card: "The welfare of the future colored citizen is both an obligation and an investment." Now, of course, the question arises in the minds of many, What is meant by the future of the colored citizen? I do not know what the author of this card means, but I have read within a year an editorial in the *Columbia State*, which is a very representative journal in this Southern country. That editorial said in unequivocal terms that the future of the South depended on the civilization and education of the negro. The substance of the editorial was that if the white people of South Carolina do not pay more attention to the education of the negroes it would be a source of care and sorrow to them in the near future. Now, I am not a politician and I do not care about matters of citizenship politically, but concerning the matter of social relations, I have always believed and I have always said, wherever I had an opportunity to say it, that the Church to which I belong did make a most pitiable blunder in the case of many of

their representatives a half a century ago. I think I am the man Bishop McDowell referred to the other day when he said we should follow the precept of Christ rather than the social teachings of Rousseau. I have said that many times, but whether I am the one he referred to or not I will stand on that platform. As a matter of fact, Christ did not teach social equality. He was not a leader in society himself. He did not mingle much with society, as I have read his life. Jesus Christ had a relationship to society, and his principles had relationship to society, but not such a relationship as to indicate that all members of society should come together upon the same platform, or all members of the same race should come upon the same platform. I find nothing of that kind in the teachings of Christ. I do find that in the teachings of Rousseau. Rousseau gave us considerable discussion of the rights of man, but very little or almost nothing about the higher duties and privileges of man. I think first of all in our Christianity we should think of obligations, of duties and responsibilities, and then I believe we should think of our place in the kingdom of Christ, and of the benefits we have received through Calvary. The question of mere rights rather takes care of itself in the course of time in the case of almost all individuals, provided they conduct themselves in accordance with the laws of the Church and for the best interest of society. I do not believe the question before us is a social or a political question. If I thought that, I would be absolutely without hesitation for one moment in the camp of the most conservative man present here. I say that simply because I think the political life of the world demands one kind of treatment, the social life demands another kind of treatment, and that matters relating to the kingdom of Jesus Christ demand another kind of treatment and greater liberty. As to such relations there is no doubt a difference of opinion among the Churches. I am now going to read you a letter, without extensive comment upon it, because I think this letter is important. I believe it teaches a lesson and indicates the tendencies of the time. I also think it is in harmony with the trend of the newest South. This letter came to me under such circumstances that I feel I would be untrue if I did not read it. I do so without necessarily approving of everything it contains, but feeling that it does include matters of importance that you should hear:

As I read our religious papers to-day and realize how men who have professed to leave all and follow the lowly Nazarene are wrangling over the unification of the two great branches of the Methodist Episcopal Church of America; how men who profess that their hearts are full of the love of God have left the main line of soul-winning and Christian development and have begun a discussion which, to all appearance, is filled with prejudice and hate, my heart aches, for I realize that God will not

and cannot use any great Church as an organization or as individuals which refuses to do the one thing that can make his work most effective.

I believe, personally, that the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, must unify if God uses us as the great evangelical Church of the world—and I believe that although he needs us as never before, he can get along without us. Can it be possible that he is saying to-day in no uncertain tones, "Unify or die"?

I am a Southern-born white woman, I love the South, and I am loyal to all the traditions and customs of the South so far as they are in accord with God's word and his commands—but before I would be untrue to the deep conviction that he has caused to be planted in my heart, I would renounce my love, my loyalty, and my pride in the fairest spot on the globe, and ask God to transplant me to the heart of some unknown land where I could be true to the wisdom he has given me.

The reason, and the only unsurmountable reason, why we do not do the thing God wants us to do, and do it now, seems to be because we Southern Methodists are not willing to go into a Church and allow the negroes to stay in it. I cannot understand any white man or woman wanting to go anywhere where the negro cannot stay. We want them on our farms; we want them to plow our land, to plant our seed, and to harvest our crops. We want them in our mines to mine the ore, to haul the ore, and to load it on the cars for market. We need them in our homes, to wash, to iron, to attend to the children, in many homes from birth until the public schools kindly release them of part of the burden.

We need them in our banks as caretakers; in our stores, offices, public buildings, to keep the buildings, deliver the goods, and in many other places of usefulness. And we need them in our churches as sextons, depending upon them to clean the church, ring the bell, and keep things generally in order. In many churches he is the only male assistant of the pastor, as the white men generally over the South have kindly consented not only to let the women run the home and the children, but the churches as well.

And you will notice that we are willing for the negroes to have a part in our business—so long as we still hold the purse strings and power—and in our homes as long as they serve, taking the cares and responsibilities off our hands. We welcome them the same way in our business and church life. They often occupy the most intimate places in the home life. I have marveled how some parents could turn over to a negro girl, often of uncertain character, the pure, sweet, little children of the home, to carry them out on the street or into dives of questionable character where their pure, innocent little lives and souls get the first stamp of vice. Yet those same parents would consider themselves disgraced to go into a church auditorium or any other place and meet the Christian negroes of the South in a common sense cause for the uplift of the whole South toward God.

It would see that we are willing that the negroes should have part in our every avenue of life as long as they are willing to plow the land, cook the meals, clean the office, act as sexton in the church—in other words, we are willing to let our Northern friends hear us refer to them as "Old Uncle John" and "Mammy Susan," our before-the-war servants (willing to "Uncle" and "Mammy" them), but gag at claiming the true relationship as God fixed it, calling them, as God calls them, our brothers and sisters in Christ.

As I see it, we need two things, and before we can decide to deal with this question as God demands us to deal with it, we must have these two things. First, we must have a vision—not so much a dream or an angel to speak to us, but a vision of the truth of God's word to teach us the right relation to our fellow man.

If God's word is true, every man is our brother and every woman our

sister, for he says in unmistakable words, "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, the bounds of their habitations." (Acts xvii. 26.)

God is not speaking in any mysterious or unknown tongue when he says this—not only brothers, however little I may like it; but God is responsible for our living right now and right here together. Are we as white men acting the part of the stronger brother?

God says again in Malachi ii. 10, "Have we not all one father? hath not God created us? why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother?" And have not our colored brothers a right to a part with us in the inheritance even of God's Church?

"The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God. And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ." (Rom. viii. 16, 17.)

They have a part in God's kingdom, and are made equal with Jesus Christ in that inheritance—and are no more simply sextons in the church, but—"Wherefore thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ." (Gal. iv. 7.)

Of course, when God spoke, or rather wrote, these words through Paul, he was not talking about our colored brother; but he was trying to show the Jews, our more favored brother, that we, the white men of America to-day (our forefathers), would stop lying, stealing, and living unclean lives, and doing so many other things which our brothers who did not acknowledge us objected to, if we through Christ became the sons of and heirs of God.

Strange how soon we can forget that only through the supreme sacrifice of Christ, our elder brother, could we even have a part now in the kingdom which some of us would deny others.

The discussion reminds me of a little story I have changed somewhat to fit just this case: There was, not very many weeks ago, a conference in hell, with the devil as usual presiding. He was trying to find out just how his emissaries were getting along upon the earth. Calling on the one nearest him, he asked what he had been doing. He said: "A great deal. I have been going to and fro over the earth making gamblers and liars, thieves and drunkards, and succeeding pretty well." The devil frowned and said: "Well, you haven't done so very much." He called another and said: "What have you been doing?" He replied: "I have been filling the world with hate. I have tried to make strife and hatred everywhere, and in a measure have succeeded." Another said: "I have been teaching the young people to be worldly, have even got some of the Church members to forget their vows." He called upon others, and they reported, but still he did not seem satisfied, until finally a little, ugly, dried-up devil, sitting over in a corner, was called upon. He got up and said: "Well, I haven't done much; sometimes I think I have failed altogether." The devil said: "Well, what have you been doing?" The little devil answered: "There is a great Church on earth, named the Methodist Church, and more than fifty years ago in America, where it had been so wonderfully used of God to hasten the coming of his kingdom, it was torn asunder over the relation between its strong and weaker brothers. Years had passed and time had come when the consecrated men of each branch of the Church saw that if they would live as Christ lived and say to an unbelieving world, 'Not I, but Christ,' and 'Follow me as I follow Christ,' they 'could not longer remain two branches of one body, but must be one in Christ.' Well, when the time seemed ripe for unification and I saw that with the uniting of these two great bodies, not only in America, but in heathen lands, wherever the messengers of these Churches go, the coming of God's kingdom would be wonderfully hastened, I grew afraid, and I knew that our cause would greatly suffer. After much study I planned

and have almost succeeded in causing so much dissension between these two branches of the same Church that I believe I will at least retard their unification until there are several first-class funerals of the body and a general dying to self of many more of the followers of Jesus Christ and retarders of the coming of his kingdom." Then he added: "I don't know that I have done very much for our cause after all." The delight of the devil knew no bounds, and pandemonium broke loose in hell. The devil embraced the ugly, dried-up imp, and said: "You are exalted above all others, for you have done more for me and my kingdom than all the rest."

Then we not only need the vision, but badly, and without fear to say with Paul, "I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision." It is not a matter of social equality or church equality or any preference we might feel, but the question is: "What does God want us to do, and are we willing to do it?" Life, after all, is but for a day; what you want or I want matters little; everything should be hinged upon what will do most to promote God's kingdom, and am I willing to do that?

Several years ago, in our annual convention of the W. C. T. U., when the church was filled with white Southern women discussing ways and means to save the South and the United States from the demon rum, I noticed there came into the second session of the convention four negroes, the presiding elder and Methodist pastors of the colored Churches and their wives. I saw that they were leaders of their race, and when they sat down on the back seat, I got up and addressed our State W. C. T. U. President, saying, "I see some of our colored brothers and sisters in the back of the church. Now, I think we have the knowledge that will solve the liquor question, and if any one needs this knowledge, it is the leaders of the negro race in the South. So I want these men and women to come to the front seats and hear what we have to say and receive the inspiration from us to carry back to their people, for they cannot receive inspiration in the back of a church, where backslidden members and the devil most generally stay." They allowed me to bring them up, but some of the white women almost died. One of the white women told this dream that afternoon, and I verily believe it was a vision from God, to whom, I am glad, she was obedient:

She went to her room at the close of the session and lay down to take a short nap. When she fell asleep she dreamed that the end of the world had come, and she saw all the nations of the earth gathered together and she saw Jesus coming to her. He said: "Daughter, I am going to get you to gather all the children of the world together and place them in heaven." She told him that she would gladly do it, and first she placed the little white children of America, then the English children, then the French, German, Spanish, and so on until she had given them all a place but the little negro children. She said: "Well, I never made any place for them on earth, so I am not going to in heaven." Just at that time she saw Jesus returning, and when she saw and realized that she had shut any one out of the kingdom of heaven, she was overcome with grief, and fell on her knees in penitence, and said: "O Christ, forgive me for my unworthiness." He gently placed his hand on her arm and said, "Look at these for whom you have made no place;" and she looked, and instead of being different, they were like all the other children of the world, and he said, "All white, washed in the blood of the Lamb."

I have read this beautiful letter simply because it was desired that I should, and because, to my mind, it represents the spirit of every man here, and of every right-thinking member of both of these great Churches. I do not for one moment think that there is a soul in either of these Churches who wants to shut

any member, black or white, red or yellow, out of the kingdom of heaven. Another thing, I do not believe any of us here want to shut out of the Church of God in the earth, the kingdom of God in this world, any people whom God has called unto himself. I am perfectly certain that the spirit in that letter, which comes from a woman of culture, refinement, and high character, indicates the real inner purpose of all of us. In some way we ought to get an adjustment of this great question that will not offend our humbler members, and that will not bring discredit upon the kingdom of Christ in the minds of people who do not understand all our history and our relations one with the other. We desire a plan which will give to both great bodies the largest possible leverage in lifting a race which has been backward out of conditions in which it has been living into such a relationship with all of life as will give them the greatest usefulness and the least power to do any harm to anybody with whom they are related. Now, I have been thinking of asking the members of the other Commission, recognizing the facts of our relationship and the history and the conditions in which we find ourselves, both legally and spiritually, as exemplified in addresses which have been made upon this floor, if they could bring themselves to say to their people, who also must see the position in which the Methodist Episcopal Church is placed and the relation which the colored members of the Methodist Episcopal Church have in that Church, We will recommend that we begin without requiring of that Church to do any act which would be out of harmony with its principles or of the necessities in which it finds itself? Would your Commission, or a majority of your Commission, be willing to say to your people that with a limited number of the colored race in the General Conference, there because of vested rights, there because of the confidence in them which the Methodist Episcopal Church reposes in them, but with no mixing in other bodies of the Church or in other relationships, we will go ahead and try the experiment of the future of Methodism? Would you be willing to propose to your people, in view of the conditions of our Church, that they be willing to receive into our supreme body any limited number whatever of these people who are already a part of ourselves? Would you be willing to recommend that to your people as an experimental proposition to be tried out, with the idea that it might in course of time seem to yourselves that it is a wise thing to have the negroes and the Japanese and the Chinese in the supreme body, or that it might in course of time seem to the colored members of our Church that it was not for them the relationship which they most coveted for themselves and which they most intimately desired when they came to a future understanding? Would you be willing to pro-

pose this matter to your people as an experiment, with a possibility of the one ultimate solution or the other, on the one hand the adjustment vindicating itself by experience and on the other hand the arrangement seeming to the colored members not to be the thing they desire? Would you be willing to propose to your Church a plan for any limited number of these people in the General Conference, or on the other hand is it your idea that you must ask of us and of the reunited Methodism, if it comes to reunion, that there shall, under no circumstances whatever, be any negro in the supreme body of the Church? I do not need to explain to any one here why I thus repeatedly raise that question, for we have to come to it in the end. This is really the issue, Shall we have to go to our colored members and say to them, "You must stay out of the supreme body of the Church altogether"? Some of you have told me, "We would never respect you if you did this." Then, is that the thing we shall be asked to do? If so, we must consider it solemnly and prayerfully to see if we can do it. Knowing that that question would arise, I have already been considering it and I suppose that others have, but we will have to consider it collectively, solemnly, and prayerfully. To get union, must we go to our colored brothers and say to them that they must get out of their relationship with us in the supreme body? Or is some other solution available to the members of your Commission, in view of the beautiful sentiment which you have expressed? Whatever you may think of me as related to the South, I was brought up here, and I know the sincerity of your representations about your people. Now, in view of your sincere protestations of love for the colored man, and in the condition in which we are placed, is it possible for you to say, We will propose to our people that, under certain restrictions (if you please, Brother Reynolds), with provision for readjustment later on, or with any other proper safeguard you may wish to mention, to which I am perfectly certain (I am speaking my own ideas now) Dr. Jones and Dr. Penn would agree, we should consent to try the experiment, we will receive a number of these men representing their people into the supreme body? Then we will determine whether or not that relationship is without objection when it is properly handled, or whether, on the other hand, it will be proven in the course of time a relationship which even to them would not be permanently desirable? Is it possible for you to make that proposition to your people? If it is, then, of course, there will be one event. If not, possibly there will be another event. But so far as I am concerned and so far as I understand our Commission, I think we would still continue to love and respect you, and to believe that

in the providence of God something else will be possible that we can agree upon.

W. N. Ainsworth: You have spoken on the termination of the experiment in case it were unsatisfactory in certain directions. Suppose it should be unsatisfactory to what is now the South, how would we cease the experiment? Will you address yourself to that point?

Bishop Leete: Of course not; that is not a situation that has arisen. I was not addressing myself to the future. I have great admiration for prophets, except for those of my own generation, whom I think most of us are little inclined to. A prophet is still "without honor in his own country." I cannot prophesy what would be the future solution of the proposition. I have, however, confidence enough in Anglo-Saxon intelligence and confidence enough in our Christian faith to believe that if an unsatisfactory situation should arise it could be settled amicably in accordance with the will of God. All I am trying to do now is to determine this one thing so that we may see ourselves clearly, understand ourselves fully, and love each other still. Just a word or two more. Is it necessary for us to say that thing to our colored brethren, or is there any possibility of your proposing any experiment to your people which would enable us to meet the situation as we find it, and as it has been indicated we believe it should be? What is the fact about this? That is the issue I am raising, and I am raising that solely because it is time for it. I wonder if you have stopped to think that we are spending \$1,500 a day in money consecrated to the uses of Methodism. You know, also, that in keeping fifty responsible men here we are obstructing the service of the world. It does seem to me that the time has come to get away from the ideal, and to get down out of the clouds. General principles, in which I thoroughly believe, have been wisely presented, but it seems to me it is time to get down to what we can do. Let me add that I have not expressed my own opinion at all. I have raised a question or two, and I have read two or three papers, but I have not expressed my opinion. This is not a matter of any importance, but I am going into that at this particular moment. I want to add that somehow or other with all my heart I believe not only in God, but I believe in my brethren. I know this unification movement is a difficult thing. I have known it all my life. Members of my own family in numbers lived in the South. My own brother has been an official in the Southern Church until a recent period, when he removed to a part of the country where it has no representation. I was brought up with about every prejudice that a Southern man ever had. I can truthfully say that, on the other hand, I think I understand exactly the feeling of the Commission

to which I belong with reference to the negro, and with reference to his life and work. But somehow or other I believe absolutely in God and wholly in my brethren. I believe God is going to help us get together in such a way that we can put our hearts into work for the colored brethren, and by the grace of God lift them up not into foolish equality, not into any political determinism that may be more ruinous to them than helpful, but into that manhood and womanhood in Christ Jesus without which I cannot see how our civilization can be saved. Without this I cannot see how the blessing of God can rest upon this country, an end to which I think every man here is ready to pledge his hand and heart. I do not believe the question before us to be a matter wholly of expediency, though I do see expediency in it. I want it taken out of that, however, and placed in the realm of divine thinking and of divine intentions.

Bishop Mouzon: I move that when we adjourn we adjourn to meet at three o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was seconded.

John F. Goucher: Would it not be in order to move that the order of the day be a consideration of a plan—

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Hardly as an amendment, but it could be offered as an independent resolution. The motion is that when we adjourn we adjourn to meet to-morrow afternoon at three o'clock. A motion to adjourn to a stated time is debatable.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I would like to know the reason for that motion.

Bishop Mouzon: I do not hesitate to give the reasons. Let me ask, however, before we go further whether we adjourn at five o'clock?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Five-thirty is the adjourning time.

Bishop Mouzon: I thought the reason would be open and plain to everybody and that there was no necessity of arguing the question. It is very important that these separate Commissions get together and that we discuss these matters and see just where we are. We each know the mind of the other quite fully, I am sure, and if we are to make definite progress from this time forward it is entirely necessary that each Commission should meet separately.

I. Garland Penn: If this is to cut out debate so that I shall not have an opportunity to speak, I should like to have that opportunity this afternoon. I thought that we would meet again to-morrow morning, and I hope this will not cut off debate, for I should like to speak.

A. F. Watkins: I most cordially desire that the Commissions should separately have an opportunity to discuss fully and ex-

haustively this subject, which has been under discussion in the Joint Commission for the past three or four days; but I see no reason in the world why that separate Commission discussion should be had until all the members of the Joint Commission who wish to express themselves upon it shall have an opportunity of doing so. Indeed, I would greatly prefer that the subject be entirely exhausted so far as the expression of the Joint Commission is concerned before the separate Commissions consider the matter.

Bishop Mouzon: I am in the fullest accord with what Dr. Watkins has just said. I certainly should deeply regret the passage of any motion which would curtail debate, and in particular which should not give Dr. Penn ample opportunity to say to us what he may desire to say. We have half an hour before the time for adjournment, if I am correctly informed, and I am somewhat of the opinion that after we have heard Dr. Penn we shall all be satisfied to go to our private meetings. However, if any small minority thinks there are others who should be heard from, or if there are others in addition to Dr. Penn who desire to speak further before we go into separate meetings, I am ready to hear them.

A. J. Lamar: I want to offer a motion, but before I offer it I want to ask Dr. Penn a question. He has not been well lately. Do you feel well enough to speak this afternoon, Dr. Penn?

I. G. Penn: I prefer to speak to-morrow morning.

A. J. Lamar: Then I think we had better not hear him now.

Bishop Mouzon: I am entirely willing, as the maker of the motion, to withdraw it.

Bishop Hamilton: I simply want to say this in addition to what Bishop Mouzon has said. Whether these brethren may desire to speak or not, there are brethren on this floor who ought to speak, ought to speak that we may know their minds. We have been free to do so on our side. All our bishops have spoken, and it cannot be otherwise inferred than that a bishop will have much influence—if not in this body, certainly when he has gone away from here, wherever his jurisdiction extends, and I am talking plainly; but I have this sort of notion, that after we have gone from here, whatever may be the decision at which we have arrived, it will be necessary for every member of this body to exercise his influence to have that decision obtain—that is, if it is one of agreement. If it is one of disagreement, the Lord knows the less we say about it the better. Now, I do not want to compel any member to speak. I have not had any notion of that kind. I am simply expressing my own mind and my own heart. I should feel that I have taken a privilege which was extended to me that I ought not to have taken as a bishop

of the Methodist Episcopal Church if we cannot hear from the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Now, if I have not spoken advisedly, lay it—well, I don't want it to go either to my head or my heart, but just lay it to something else.

Bishop Atkins: I desire to say in connection with the statement of Bishop Hamilton that I do not know the purpose of my colleagues, but I have been fostering a speech for three or four days.

Bishop Cranston: And after the manner of the United States Senate, I want to give notice that I propose to address you myself on this subject to-morrow.

Bishop McDowell: I do not think that is right. As the Chairman to-morrow, he can give himself the floor any time he wants to.

Rolla V. Watt: I only want to add one word. If Bishop Mouzon withdrew his motion simply in order that Dr. Penn should have an opportunity to speak, that would make it natural that the others should cease preparation of their extemporaneous speeches. I have felt anxious to hear the whole story. I have come a greater number of miles than any other brother of the Commission, unless possibly Dr. Randall, to hear this debate, and I want to hear it, and I want the time left open long enough for every man to speak on the subject who desires to speak.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That motion has been withdrawn.

Rolla V. Watt: I know, but I was afraid it might be renewed when Dr. Penn finished, and I want it to stay open until everybody is through.

Bishop McDowell: A question of information. I would like to ask for the information of the Joint Commission. Dr. Lamar made a statement this morning touching the desire of the Commission from the Church, South, as to separate consideration of certain subjects before we vote. Will you state again what that agreement is?

A. J. Lamar: The agreement was simply to this effect. It was rather informal. I think that all our Commission agreed that before we come to a final vote on the question of a report to the General Conference we should meet as separate Commissions.

E. C. Reeves: It was that on a call of five members we should meet. You forgot that.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Brother Reeves is out of order.

W. N. Ainsworth: I can answer that question a little more definitely than it has been answered. We did not have any discussion of this pending meeting; but when our Commission was

together the other evening a motion was made by myself, seconded, and quickly put and passed, that if at any time during the progress of the meeting of the Joint Commission any five members of our Commission should signify to our Chairman that we desired to retire for conference he would ask that the Commission be dissolved for that purpose. We have not provided that there shall be any separate meeting of the Commissions, but we have provided a way in which we can have separate meetings if we desire.

Bishop McDowell: I think it is perfectly competent if either Commission desires to have a separate session that it should do so. I only wanted to know what the action was on which Dr. Lamar's statement was based. I think it is perfectly competent for either Commission to agree that before any tentative vote is taken as to this matter, after the long discussion, the members of the Commissions may go apart and take their own bearings before taking even a tentative vote in the Joint Commission. I just wanted to know what was the understanding in the case. I think possibly certain brethren in this house might feel that the discussion could go on with a good deal more freedom if it were understood that at the end of the debate we would go apart and take stock, as it were, before voting.

E. B. Chappell: I think we shall undoubtedly do that.

Bishop Mouzon: I move that we adjourn.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The hymn, "Arise, My Soul," was sung, and the session was dismissed with prayer by the Rev. Claudius B. Spencer.

SIXTH DAY, TUESDAY, JANUARY 29, 1918.

MORNING SESSION.

The Joint Commission met pursuant to adjournment and was called to order by Bishop Collins Denny.

The hymn, "Faith of our fathers, living still," was sung.

Rev. John M. Moore read John i. 1-14 and led in prayer.

The hymn, "Lead on, O King Eternal," was sung.

The roll call was had, and the following were present: Bishops Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. B. Murrah, James Atkins, Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Ministers: F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, C. M. Bishop, J. M. Moore, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar, Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. W. Van Cleve, J. J. Wallace;

C. M. Stuart, reserve. Laymen: M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White, G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, H. W. Rogers, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock.

The minutes of the last session were read and approved.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Before turning over the chair to Bishop Cranston as the presiding officer this morning: the morning paper contained a statement that ought to be corrected. It is very difficult for either side of this Commission to fully understand the other. I have found it impossible to get my brethren to understand just the position in which we are placed. The statement to which I refer was that no teacher is allowed in Virginia to teach a white school until he has taught in a negro school. That is not a fact. There are a number of men on this floor who have not only taught in negro Sunday schools, men from the South, but have also taught negroes their letters and to read, and we have felt that it was a privilege to be able to do that work; but how a statement as that published in the paper could have been given I do not know. I simply take occasion to announce that it is not true, and if it were necessary I could give ample evidence that it is not true. I call attention to it because it purports to come from some member of the Commission.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Commission now has under consideration the subject which has been before the house for some days.

Bishop Mouzon: I now move that when we adjourn this morning we adjourn to meet at 9:30 to-morrow morning.

The motion was seconded.

Edgar Blake: I hope the motion of Bishop Mouzon will not be pressed, and if pressed that it will not be agreed to, and for two reasons. My first reason is this: If his motion should carry, it would appear to limit this general discussion to this morning's session. If you will run over the minutes of the previous sessions, I think you will find as a rule only about four men have spoken during a session. Sometimes there have been five and sometimes three, but, on an average, about four, and I do not believe that Bishop Mouzon has any desire in his heart to prevent any member from speaking on this question, in this general discussion, who may desire to do so. It would seem, therefore, to be nothing but fair to those who have not taken the opportunity to speak to hold this motion in abeyance until all who desire have spoken. My second reason is this: I question very much whether we ought to go into separate sessions until we have something more definite before us than we have at the present time.

I believe that we are making progress in this general discussion, and if we avoid unduly pressing the matter of any extra haste I think we shall make further progress by so doing.

Bishop Mouzon: I have made the motion because I earnestly desire that we may do something before we adjourn. It will be recalled that at the Baltimore session of this Convention I earnestly endeavored to get through the Commission some brief resolutions summing up the consensus of opinion of the Commission. I have regretted from that day to this that the Commission did not agree to what was proposed at that time. We should be much farther along than we are now. I fear if we spend too long a time in this general discussion there will be a breaking away and we shall not be able to go before our Churches with the kind of a report that we should present to the Churches. The coming together of the separate Commissions does not mean at all that general discussion is going to be prevented, and the purpose of my motion is not that discussion shall be curtailed. The purpose is to facilitate matters. It is that after we have continued our general discussion this morning we shall have an opportunity to get together, you of the Methodist Episcopal Church and we of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and sum up the results and see where we are, and we can then more intelligently continue our discussion. I should greatly regret if anyone thought I desired to prevent my brothers from making those speeches that they have been so carefully working on for the last few days. I am sure those speeches ought to be made, and I hope nothing will prevent my good friend Dr. Blake from making that speech we want to hear from him arguing for the Independent Colored Church. So do I want to hear the speeches of the other members, but I desire greatly that we shall have an opportunity to meet separately this afternoon.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Aside from what Dr. Blake has suggested, there are two reasons why I think Bishop Mouzon's motion should prevail. If the separate Commissions meet, we might have some general debate afterwards; but I don't think there are in either Commission more than a few men at the outside who feel as entirely free to express their thoughts, if such separate meetings were held and some conclusions reached by the majority of the separate Commissions that did not coincide with the views of the individual members, as they would feel free to express themselves if no such meetings were held. As a corollary to that, and recalling the events at Traverse City, you will recollect that when we were all groping in the dark at Traverse City as to the General Conferences and the Regional Conferences and their relations to each other, and none of us were able to see our way through the difficulty that faced us, there came from

one of the silent, but one of the ablest members of the Commission, all the light that we needed. I refer to Dr. Hyer's speech at Traverse City, and no man can tell when he or some other of the silent members of the Commission will evolve something that we can take hold of and get out of all our darkness into the light. We have said over and over again that this is the crux of the situation. We have reached the crux of the discussion of the crux of the situation; and I should be very sorry if any member of the Commission were debarred or hindered or retarded in the slightest way from expressing the fullness of his heart to the Joint Commission at any time.

A vote being taken, Bishop Mouzon's motion was declared lost, and the Chair recognized Dr. Penn.

I. Garland Penn: One of the brethren from the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, said to me yesterday: "Dr. Penn, it must be a little unpleasant to hear your race discussed as you are being discussed here." I did not say to him that it was unpleasant, because I have been genuinely interested in every address that has been made during the discussion of this subject. It has confirmed in my mind what I have always believed, that whatever may be the outcome of the deliberations of this Joint Commission, the negro is going to benefit by it. I am very much in the position of the little boy who was always at the foot of his class in school, and on coming home one day with his report, showing that he was still at the foot, his father remonstrated and said: "Johnnie, I wish you would get away from the foot of the class and get at the head. It is very humiliating to your father to find you always at the foot of the class." And Johnnie looked up into his father's face and said: "Papa, don't worry about that: they teach the same thing at both ends." So I am not particularly worried. I have heard in the speeches of the brethren from the South, as well as those of our brethren from the North, expressions of genuine interest in the negro and of a determination to help him wherever they can. Before entering upon the general discussion I want to say that I am exceedingly interested in the unification of the two Churches. In every General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church I have voted for the appointment of a Commission on Federation or Union. I have read and watched every proceeding concerning these negotiations, and I have tried from time to time to contribute some little bit toward the successful consummation of this matter. It may not have appeared to some of our friends what I have individually tried to do, but it has been my desire to get our colored people in such a frame of mind as that they would not constitute any barrier to a realization of unification. I am one of the members of the Committee of the Methodist Epis-

copal Church on Federation of the Colored Methodist Churches. The first thought that came to me in this relation was, "Is it possible to get together in one body the colored Methodists of this country?" To that end I besought the chairman of our Commission to call together the same, that through this Commission there might be a call issued for a joint meeting of the Commissions of the Colored Methodist Churches. I had in mind the discussion of matters by the Commissions of the various colored Churches which would lead to closer federation and in the end to unification of Colored Methodism. On assembling, I found that union could not be seriously considered, and that the best we could do would be to consider matters of federation. That federation and coöperation were possible only came from the distinctly Negro Methodist Churches. I am prepared to say here and now, brethren, that the matter of getting these Colored Methodists together, so far as I see it, is almost impossible. The bishops of these distinctly Negro Methodist Churches are to meet in Louisville on February 12. I have seen the statement that in this meeting there is to be no discussion concerning union of the colored bodies, although I know some of the bishops favor organic union. Most of them seem to think that to accomplish certain ends of coöperation and federation they should say to their various bodies that they are not going to discuss union. The Joint Commission of Negro Methodists entered into certain agreements at Cincinnati concerning matters of coöperation and federation, but nothing has been done. This is true simply for the reason that we cannot get the distinctly negro bodies to act. I say to you now that there seem to be such differences of opinion among these brethren that although we talk here concerning the possibility of their union, such seems very remote. I am interested in the unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, for the reason that I believe nothing could happen to my race in the South of greater moment than to have the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, back of them. I give you some instances of what I think would come to us from unification. These and other reasons make me intensely interested. It happens that my former home was, and present Church relations are, in Lynchburg, Va. I am familiar with the Court Street Methodist Episcopal Church, South, of that city, and have always been greatly interested in it. The men of the Court Street Methodist Episcopal Church, South, have been among my warmest personal friends. The man who owned my mother was a member of that Church, and until his death was one of the best friends I ever had. His sons are to-day among the closest friends that I have in this country. I am profoundly interested in that Church. We have a school

located in the city of Lynchburg, listed as one of our Freedmen's Aid Society Schools of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and we needed funds for that school. I went to that city a few weeks ago for the purpose of interesting our white and colored people in aiding us to do a certain work in connection with the institution. We were fortunate to get Bishop McDowell to come down and spend a Sunday with us. I felt that to have the Bishop preach at the Court Street Methodist Episcopal Church, South, to those blessed people and then in turn to bring these people over to our colored church in the afternoon, and in this way have a day of fraternal relations between the two races, would work for the benefit of all of us in that city. This arrangement was made. I wish you to note how this matter worked itself out, for much has been said of social equality in this Commission which I think has no place in the discussion. The first thing our colored pastor said was, "You are correct, Brother Penn, in wanting the Court Street Church to have the opportunity to hear our Bishop McDowell." And so our colored pastor and the principal of our school went out to the depot to meet the Bishop and turned him over to Dr. Booker, the pastor of the Court Street Methodist Episcopal Church, South, for the courtesies that I knew the white people in that city would be glad to give him. The Bishop preached at the Court Street Methodist Church, South, greatly to the edification of the white people on Sunday morning, and on Sunday afternoon we had a great mass meeting and the leading white people of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, came over to worship with the colored people. We had a profitable afternoon of song and old plantation melodies with great addresses from the two white brothers of the city and Bishop McDowell. We closed out with one of the greatest interracial occasions known to that city. The next day and during the days of the week, principally from the white people, we collected \$1,000 in aid of our colored institution. What happened at the Court Street Methodist Church, South, and our colored church in the city of Lynchburg in promoting such amicable racial relations could have happened in Memphis or Vicksburg or in any other city of the South. I believe it would happen all the more, if we could have such a relation as that our white people of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, through unification or union with the Methodist Episcopal Church, would feel organically responsible for the advancement and progress of our people. Let me say, my brethren, I have seen representative preachers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, come into our colored Annual Conferences in the South who were desirous of helping and most liberal in their feelings. I now remember one particular case in Alabama when we were holding

an efficiency conference. This man was greatly interested in the negroes in the town where the Conference was held, and when there was under discussion a certain phase of local conditions inimical to the interest of our race this man sat there and said to me, "I deplore this; I wish I had the opportunity to say it, and to know that I was wanted to say it." In addressing the Conference I said that if we could have unification so we could have the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, come into our Conferences as a part of us, and thus feel responsible for the lives and property of our people around them, many conditions which are almost unbearable for the negro in these cities, towns, and counties could be remedied. I feel that way about the matter, and I do not want anybody to think for a minute that I would put anything in the way of a real unification; but I hope and am praying that the outcome will be a union of Churches in which the negro has as much to gain as anybody else who are parties to the plan. I want to address myself this morning not so much to the matter of rights involved, although we have legal rights—vested rights—which are dear and sacred to the negro. Some leader of the negroes in our country has said to them, "Don't you talk so much about your rights; get ready to enjoy your rights, make yourself worthy of the rights." There is something in that, so I do not address myself particularly to the matter of rights, although we must not, as men, surrender our legal rights. I am especially anxious to address myself today to the matter of the help that is coming to the colored people in and out of the Methodist Episcopal Church from interracial religious contact. Before addressing myself to that particular line of thought, I want to say, brethren, this personal word. I have been a member of the General Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church for twenty-eight years. I have been an official in the Methodist Episcopal Church, traveling throughout the country, for twenty years. I have known the bishops. I have heard them speak. I have been in our Annual Conferences, white and colored, for all these years, and have come personally in contact with our white ministry everywhere in the United States. I have been to meetings here, there, and everywhere all over the country, and have never heard a bishop or any other white man in a place of power in the Methodist Episcopal Church talk to the negroes in any way whatever that would lead them to expect what the South calls social equality. Referring to this matter of the exodus of the negroes North, no white men who have ever been in the South, coming in contact with our people, have been more persistent in telling them that they ought to stay in the South and work out their salvation down there, than have been the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church

who have held our colored Annual Conferences in the South. They have spoken on that subject at times in such a way that leaders of our race have felt they were overstepping the bounds, in view of certain conditions, in advising the colored people to remain altogether in the South. I need not specify these men, for you know the men who hold the colored Conferences in the South. Let me tell you, brethren, and I speak frankly, I hope you will get out of your minds the idea that the negro wants anything like so-called social equality. It is as far from us as the moon, and a little farther. We don't want it. I make haste to say that it is one of the things that we would work with you to put down in the South. This matter of our representation in the General Conference and our relations to the unified Methodist Church has nothing in it of social equality. I have often said that I am not interested in the men with whom I eat, nor am I interested with eating with any particular man, but I am infinitely more interested in having something to eat. And so, let that pass. As to our interracial religious relationship in the Methodist Episcopal Church, let me say that statement after statement has been made, in the press and on this floor since we have entered into these discussions and meetings, that the negro in the Methodist Episcopal Church has not grown and made progress as he has in the distinctively negro Churches. I have gone to the trouble to get these facts, and I make the statement that the negro in the Methodist Episcopal Church has made as much progress, and I think I can prove, in consideration of the fact that one has had negro leadership and the other has not, that the negro in the Methodist Episcopal Church has made more numerical progress than the negro in any distinctively negro Church. Dr. Chappell has attempted to show that, in view of the fact that we have only 310,000 members out of 1,800,000 negro Methodists, we have not made progress. He forgets the facts of history as follows: The African Methodist Episcopal Church has been organized in this country one hundred years and the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church one hundred years. These organizations existed in the North fifty years before the emancipation, and they secured all the Methodist negroes in those two bodies. They had distinct organizations and membership at the close of the Civil War. Do we suppose that at the close of the war, when the Methodist Episcopal Church came South to help educate and uplift the negro race, those organizations were going to disband and go into the Methodist Episcopal Church? Not at all. These organizations did just what the Methodist Episcopal Church did. When the war was over, the African Methodist Episcopal Church and the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church went South and began work

in organizing the negroes into their organizations, just as the Methodist Episcopal Church did. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, had a remnant of the negro membership of 74,000, who desired in 1872 to be organized into an independent body. I have been immensely interested in the history of the offer of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, to these brethren of a separate General Conference. Do you know why those brethren did not accept the separate General Conference? It is much the same as why the negro in the Methodist Episcopal Church to-day will not accept a separate General Conference. The negroes at that time, as the negroes at this time, and for better reasons now than then, would rather occupy an independent relation to a white body than to sustain a relationship in the governing body—the General Conference, which has in it, on its face, a discrimination against the negro in relation to the parent body. That is why all these distinctively negro organizations have grown up, not of initiatives on their part to organize a distinctively negro body, but rather into distinctive negro organizations, just as it is possible, under certain conditions, for a negro organization to develop among the negroes in the Methodist Episcopal Church out of protest against discrimination on the part of the parent body. The African Methodist Episcopal Church says the reason they organized was that in the old St. George Church at Philadelphia they were required to take seats in the gallery, and the A. M. E. Zions something similar, while any leader of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church will tell you that an independent body was preferable to anticipated race distinctions, if organically connected with the M. E. Church, South. Some of the bishops of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church have said that under the then existing circumstances they felt they could grow better by having independent relations. I contend that the negro in the Methodist Episcopal Church has grown in membership. I repeat they have grown just about as rapidly as the negroes in the distinctively Colored Methodist Churches. I remind you again that the A. M. E. Church has been in operation for one hundred years, and also the A. M. E. Zion Church, yet the African Methodist Episcopal Church has 620,000 and our Zion brethren 529,000, taking the last religious census for the correctness of the same. We have been in existence only fifty years as against their existence of one hundred years, yet we have over half the membership of either. The Colored Methodist Church started with 74,000 in 1874, and we had 125,000. The Colored Methodist Episcopal Church numbers now 240,000, and we have 310,000 full members and 40,000 probationers. We were about 50,000 in the lead of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church in 1874, and we are 100,000 in the

lead of them to-day, having 71,000 more full members than they and 40,000 probationers, and that in spite of the fact, which is a very important item, that each one of these Churches has had negro episcopal leadership and their stock in trade has been the argument that we were led by white bosses and they were free. These indisputable facts should be sufficient argument to stop all misrepresentation about our failure to make numerical progress as compared with distinctively negro bodies. I say, if we had from 1870 down until this time the same kind of episcopal leadership, so far as it has related itself in actual work among the people in leading them in evangelistic and financial campaigns, which we have in real episcopal leadership to-day, we would be two-thirds in advance of the membership we have. It is well known that for a long time in the Methodist Episcopal Church the negro had no practical and effective episcopal supervision in the South. The bishops came down and held Conferences and stayed a few days, and went back to their Northern homes. We now have aggressive, forceful leadership in each of the Colored Conferences in the South, and I predict that the future membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, unification or not, is going to advance by leaps and bounds. Now, my friends, I plead for interracial religious contact. I mean contact somewhere that will be truly organic and actual, for I am persuaded, brethren, that it will be sad for the negro, likewise for our white people in this country, whenever there is a line drawn in Church and State and the negroes are on one side and the white men on the other side, the white men not knowing what the negroes are thinking or saying, and the negroes not knowing what the white men are thinking and saying. For emphasis, I say, it would be sad for both races. It will be a sad day from the fact that the negro, not coming in contact at all, at any place, with the white man, will grow, as many of the African Methodists and the African Zion Methodists have grown, immensely distrustful of the white man's purposes with regard to all that relates to the well-being of the negro. Dr. Reynolds has been on the right line, and he is giving you very important information when he reports that upon consulting negro ministers in Arkansas he found that the A. M. E. and the A. M. E. Zion ministers do not welcome the white man's advice and do not believe in your help as do the ministers of the C. M. E. and the M. E. Churches. The cause for such is lack of organic contact. I say, brethren of the South, in all candor, but with a heart full of love, that you do not know the negro as do the white men of the Methodist Episcopal Church. You do not come into his Conferences. You do not have the opportunity in a Conference for six days to study the negro's racial life and aspirations. You

are not coming in among my people. I know you say you do, but that is an error. You know it through some other negro that works with you, but you don't know it like the white people of the Methodist Episcopal Church; and if there is anything that could be in any way framed by which white men in the South could see and know personally the progress of the negro race, it would mean everything to us and a great deal to them. I believe thoroughly in interracial religious contact for these reasons. Now, as to the financial help of the negro by the white man. Brothers, the negro was in slavery for 250 years. It is reported that one of the English Ambassadors to our country said this: "It will be time enough to relinquish your help of the negro when you have given him help for as many years as he was held in slavery." I don't know so much about that; but I do know this, that the negro is entitled to help upon the part of the white man for a few years longer on the basis that he worked in the South for years and years as a chattel, as a slave without a single penny of remuneration. I do not like to go back to the past for any reason in this discussion. I want to leave it behind me. I am like St. Paul, I want to forget the things past. I do not live in the past. I want to look to the things that are before me and press toward them. Yet, let me say that I hardly think of the yesterday of the negro but that I shudder at what my people had to undergo. I know there were plenty of good people in the South. My mother was in the family of some people who were as good to my people as it was possible to be, and I know there were many others of that kind throughout the South; but I say that the system of slavery was destructive of aspiration, and ennobled and enthroned wrong rather than right. I say that I believe, as did the Ambassador, that for a long time yet the negro is entitled to the moral and uplifting help of the white people in every conceivable way. When I speak of financial help to our people, I mean to say that they are not getting what they ought to have in view of the cruel past, and I mean to say that they are no pensioners or wards. Under present freedom they are getting what they were not able to get and were deprived of under another condition fifty years ago, over which they had no control. It is poor pay for unrequited toil about which the payee has no right to complain. The Methodist Episcopal Church has helped the negro. Take our Freedmen's Aid Society. We have property to the extent of \$2,127,000 in the interest of negro education; also an endowment of \$734,000, making a total of \$2,861,000. In these schools we have 5,864 people. In 1916 the Methodist Episcopal Church helped the negro in direct contributions from all boards to the extent of \$282,397.01, of which the colored people themselves raised \$77,892.06, leaving net help

of \$204,504.95. I want to direct your attention to another point that has been misunderstood. Some people talk about our being wards and dependents. As a matter of fact, the negro in the Methodist Episcopal Church to-day is making more progress in giving than the negro in any Church in proportion to number. I am prepared to prove these facts by the actual statistics. The negro Methodist Churches doing foreign work are the A. M. E. Church and the A. M. E. Zion Church. The A. M. E. Church has 620,000 members, and raised in 1916, from all sources, \$41,689.46 for foreign missions; while the 310,000 colored members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, from the reports of pastors, raised only \$20,000. The A. M. E. Zion Church, with 568,608 members, raised \$14,000, as compared with our \$20,000 from 310,000 members. We raised \$19,000 for the Home Mission and Church Extension Board, \$31,786.42 for the Freedmen's Aid, and for the Board of Education \$3,298. Sometimes it is said that the negroes are pensioners. The Board of Education loaned us, last year, about \$5,950 to help poor negro students in school. We reported collections for the Board of \$3,298. Another striking instance of self-support is in our Sunday school work. Last year the Board of Sunday Schools spent \$3,925 upon the colored work. We reported to the treasurer of the Board \$4,637. As will be noted, this is \$712 more than the Board had spent upon the colored work, when they had two men traveling in the South as field secretaries among the colored people. Since the Board of Sunday Schools has discontinued the services of the one man who wrote the article in *Zion's Herald* concerning the separate General Conferences, our report to the Board above that expended upon us will be over \$2,000. The man above referred to was discontinued largely because he is *persona non grata* among our people and cannot do effective service. Take the matter of Conference claims. There came to us in appropriation for 1916, from the Board of Conference Claimants, \$4,200. The amount of \$3,700 was sent to the Board the same year. We have sent quite every penny to the Board of Temperance to cover what was expended by that Board in maintaining a colored man in the field. I want to make another comparison, and in this I am trying to show that, because of the interracial religious coöperation of the two races, we have done what no other Church has done in the South, even the distinctively negro Churches. In 1874, which is forty-two years ago, the negroes in the Methodist Episcopal Church contributed but \$11,032 for all benevolences. We gave \$77,000 for benevolences in 1916, an increase for the forty-two years of nearly \$2,000 per year. Now, brothers, I want to make some other comparisons which I hope will not be regarded as odious, because my heart is

right. I simply want to bring out the facts. One of you gentlemen has said that we have been helped a great deal in the local churches by our white people in the South. You have done that, and that is to your credit, but let us have a comparison of what has been done for the negro by the Methodist Episcopal Church in an organized way, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. The Methodist Episcopal Church contributed to the religious and educational work among the negroes for the year 1916 \$203,504.93. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, helped the Colored Methodist Church to the amount of \$46,000. Ten thousand of this \$46,000 was pledged by local white men of a given Southern city, which did not go through the regular connectional channels of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, just as thousands of dollars given the negroes by local men of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the negroes' uplift in New York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Chicago, and other cities does not pass through regular connectional Church boards. The amount in favor of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the help of the negro over what the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is doing, is \$157,504.93. I believe the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is going to do more, and I do not make this statement at all for the purpose of minimizing what they have done. But, brothers, the negro in the Methodist Episcopal Church is nevertheless looking at those figures. He is human like everybody else, and he is studying figures. You have the chance to help the negro in the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, and help him by appropriation, but the amount is so small the negro can hardly be persuaded that separate relations will give to him the same measure of interest and the kind of help that organic relations will give him. Don't blame him, for he is simply studying facts. Then there is the greater question—viz., the races must cultivate friendly relations. I have spoken about that. The mission of the Methodist Episcopal Church has been to the entire negro race. Men have spoken on this floor as though the Methodist Episcopal Church is dealing with only 310,000 negroes, and that now we are just called upon so to arrange ourselves as that we may help the entire negro race. The Methodist Episcopal Church has been, through all these years, helping the entire negro race through the 310,000 members. In the Meharry Medical College we have more students of other denominations than of the Methodist Episcopal Church by at least 75 per cent. Of the 5,864 pupils in our schools, at least 40 (if not 50) per cent are of other Churches. We have been doing our full share of educating the entire race. Let me give you an example. I saw in some paper where some member of this Commission, in discussing the matter of union, said that the Methodist Episcopal

Church had failed in its way of handling the negroes. Let us see about that. Let us look at what our Freedmen's Aid Society has done. One of the graduates of the Society's school was appointed minister to Liberia. One is a bishop for Africa. One of them argued the case before the Supreme Court affecting the segregation ordinances in certain Southern cities. Another argued the case involving the validity of the separate coach law. Another is Special Assistant to Secretary of War Baker; another is at the head of the Freedmen's Hospital in Washington, and is the only negro physician in the world who has charge of a great hospital involving such responsibility. I could stand here for the whole day and tell how our mission had been to the entire negro race, and has made it possible for the education of an outstanding negro leadership that is leading the negro everywhere. Take Emmett J. Scott, aside from anybody else, who is a graduate of one of the Freedmen's Aid Society's schools. He has helped and is helping the government and the whole country by his wise suggestions and the exercise of good judgment in handling the negro in relation to this war. If nothing had been done by the Methodist Episcopal Church save to have a man trained and ready for an emergency such as we have now, it were well worth much of the money and sacrifice which has been made. The world is in the throes of war, and the negro is as ready to pour out his life's blood for America as any white man. We are ready to bare our breasts and stand side by side with you white men and your sons and brave the dangers of war. Meharry Medical School has sent one hundred physicians, dentists, and pharmacists into the Medical Reserve Corps of the National Army. All are officers, one being a major, four captains, and the remainder first lieutenants. I am going to close by saying that the negro cannot abrogate the rights and privileges now enjoyed in the Methodist Episcopal Church in representation in the General Conference, by going into a separate General Conference or an independent Church unless driven to do so. The very argument which has been made here as the reason why we ought not to have representation in the General Conference is the very argument which makes a self-respecting negro refuse to abrogate that right. What has the negro of to-day to do with the reconstruction period? I know nothing about it and care less. It is behind me. I am told it was grievous to many. I suppose some negroes became intoxicated with freedom, and new rights conferred and backed by white men called "carpetbaggers" made a condition that may have been very grievous, but of the actual facts I know nothing. I take it for granted that everything that has been said about it is true; but what has the reconstruction period to do with the recognition of negroes in the

General Conference of a reunited Methodism in the noonday of 1918? I ask you again, What have Constitutional Conventions to do with it? When we rope in Constitutional Conventions and Jim Crow car enactments of the seventies, and what they have sought to do for the negro, and the reconstruction period, giving such as a basis and a reason why the negro is to be denied his right of representation in the General Conference forty years thereafter, in 1918, it is the very argument that complicates the situation and betrays the hidden reasons for refusing to recognize the negro's just demands. This is not a political question, but a religious one. We are dealing with religious privilege and opportunity, and the method of settling political and social questions should not enter into the same. The negro naturally says, "I have enjoyed the right of representation in the Methodist Episcopal Church in my ignorance, and now in my intelligence I will not abrogate it." I do not care to be regarded as hard-headed, arrogant, and egotistic. I want to be delivered of that; but I am a self-respecting man and I have a boy who is a Methodist minister and is to live in the Methodist Episcopal Church in the future. In the light of what his father and grandfather enjoyed for five generations in Methodism, I submit, it is my duty to think seriously of him before I give it up. What I say of myself, I say of every negro throughout the Methodist Episcopal Church. Now, I feel the impelling question from somebody who says, What are you willing to do? I am willing to do this: Brother Jones expressed it when he said he was willing to yield to proportional reduction in representation. When I saw Dr. Goucher's paper in the *Methodist Review*, I looked over it, and I said to a friend near me, "Doctor, I think I see the possibility of being able to contribute something more to this matter." Dr. Goucher's proposal is that there shall be twelve representatives in the General Conference. Is it possible that the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, would agree to twelve negroes in the General Conference out of about four hundred? Twelve negroes in the General Conference would give no more trouble than R. E. Jones and myself have given in this body, and would infringe no more upon your so-called social rights and prerogatives than we have. The people who try to make the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, think that the negro would do that are erecting a bogey man. They are seeing something that will never occur. I have seen in one of the *Advocates* of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, that if there should be held a General Conference in Atlanta, the negroes would be expecting to go into the hotels of Atlanta and all such foolish stuff. In that case the negroes would do just as Dr. Jones and I have done in Savannah. They would take

care of themselves, and meet you in the General Conference, do their work, get out, and go about their business. There is one thing in the preferential plan of the Committee's report for which I never could stand—viz., that the negro cannot vote on constitutional questions. Gentlemen, I will tell you straight, but in love, that if I can prevent it, my people are not to be disfranchised in the Methodist Episcopal Church or in the reunited Methodist Church. I had just as well be plain. In closing, let me say, Judge Reeves, the negro has been loyal and faithful to our white people in the South. They really love the white people of the South, and respond so readily to their kindness. I wonder sometimes how long it will be before these facts will be so thoroughly appreciated that we may enter upon that new day, that Brother Snyder has been talking about, for the representative negroes who have been educated by the States and by the Church. I never forget that story about Bishop Kilgo. He had sciatica when he was President of Trinity College, and he had to have one of the professors in the institution give him an electric massage. His faithful old negro servant carried him over to the professor's room. While the professor was getting his instrument ready, and the sparks were flying, the old colored man, loving Bishop Kilgo as he did, looked at the Bishop and said, "Doctor, are they going to try that on you?" and the Bishop said, "Yes." The professor kept adjusting his machine and the sparks kept flying, and the old negro man asked again, "Doctor, are they going to try that on you?" "Yes, Sam." Finally, while the professor was adjusting the machine and the sparks were still flying, the old colored man with tears coursing down his cheeks said, "Professor, are you going to try that on the Doctor?" The professor said, "Yes." The old colored man looked through his tears into Dr. Kilgo's face and then into the professor's and said, "Try it on me first." O brothers, the loyalty of the negro to you! I never pass through the streets of Atlanta but that I stand with head uncovered and look at the monument to the immortal Henry W. Grady, and read what it says of the loyalty, the faithfulness, and the affection of the negro to his master in times of war. Said Grady: "A thousand torches applied by the negroes left at home could have ended the Confederacy at once, but they were faithful to their trust." My father was one and my mother was another who were faithful to their trusts, faithful to what was left in their hands. Mr. Blackford said the other day in Lynchburg, Va., when he was speaking on the same platform with Bishop McDowell, and looking into the faces of a thousand negroes: "I cannot help but give you a fair deal. I cannot help but have feeling for you, because when my father shouldered a musket and went away to war he

left me and my mother in the hands of an old colored man, and when my father came back he found me unmolested, and he found mother there too." Mr. Blackford broke down in tears as well as myself. But, you may say, that was the old negro. I will close by telling you something of the new negro. Down in Waco there came down the street one day an automobile. Running over the street was a little white girl who did not see the automobile and knew not of her danger. A negro boy coming along, and seeing that the automobile was going to run over the little white girl, jumped out in the street, threw himself against the automobile, took the girl by the arm and threw her to the side. He saved the girl, but maimed himself, breaking his leg. Citizens of Waco pronounced him a hero and sent his name to the Carnegie Hero Commission, and they gave him a medal and set aside a sum to educate him. He was sent to Tuskegee to be educated, and one day Major Moton called him in and said: "John, when you saw that the little girl was about to be run over, did you jump out there to save her because you thought you might get some money or some honor, that for such a deed people might think you were great and your name might be heralded as a 'hero?'" The boy looked up and said: "Major, I didn't think anything about that." "What did you think about?" said the Major. The negro boy said: "The only thing I thought about was that there was a soul and that the little girl was helpless, with no one around to save her, and the automobile was going to run over her. I just felt as though I was ready, if it killed me, to save that poor little girl, and I just jumped and saved her." I wonder if humanity of that kind, examples of which I could enumerate over and over again, is not entitled to a fair, square, and untrammelled deal?

Bishop Murrah: There seems to be a desire on the part of many of the members of the Commission that some of us should define our attitude in regard to this whole question. Certainly, as far as I am personally concerned, I have no sort of objection to complying with that desire and gratifying it as far as I can. I have supposed that my position in regard to this entire matter was very clearly understood. I certainly have had no sort of disposition to disguise it. When I came into this room yesterday morning I had in mind the thought that I would discuss certain principles that seemed to me to underlie the main proposition. Dr. Lamar was speaking, and after I had listened to him I realized that he had said substantially what I would have said in regard to these principles. So I thought it would not be profitable to continue the discussion of that phase of the question. I confess to a sort of embarrassment in making an application of the principles involved. I have been led, and I think unalter-

ably, to the conclusion that I cannot support anything except something that looks to the establishment of an independent Church for the negro Methodists in the United States. In other words, I stand squarely upon the platform announced by our Conference at Oklahoma City. I do not stand here because I regard it as an ultimatum, for I do not think we would be here at all if that were the case. I think we have considerable freedom here, but I stand on that platform because I believe it is the only thing practicable; and while I simply give it as my opinion, I do not believe we could with any sort of hope expect to carry anything through our Church that did not recommend this policy. I do not believe the declaration made by our General Conference at Oklahoma City would have passed if it had not been accompanied by a recommendation for an independent Church. I appreciate thoroughly what has been said about this not being an issue here. No one understands better than I do that we cannot establish an independent Church for the negroes. That is their affair. But I do think the relevancy of what I may have to say will appear when I illustrate my position and indicate the attitude I shall assume when we come to vote on these matters. I am influenced in this whole business by my great interest in the negro. I know that a statement of that kind smacks a little of cant, but I am so thoroughly conscious of my absolute sincerity in this matter that I have no misgivings in that regard. Because of my great interest in the negro I confess to you with the utmost candor that these efforts to so whittle down everything that concerns his rights and privileges so that, as has been said on the floor of this Commission, his representation in the General Conference would be nearly negligible, does not appeal to me. If anyone here thinks that would satisfy the negro, he does not know him as I do. And then, I cannot favor the suggestion that we ought to go before our Churches and say that "We are just trying a little experiment; it does not mean anything much; it can do no harm; let it work a little while, and if it does not suit we can discard it"—why, if we are to go before the Church in that half-hearted way I have no idea that there is an Annual Conference anywhere that would ratify it. Now, let me say a few words about my interest in the negro. I lived among these people all my life, and interest in them is stimulated by the very deepest affection. It would not be necessary for me to say that in some places. I have thought and sometimes said that I would not prefer to live anywhere in this world or the next where I could not be with the negroes. I have been over this globe pretty extensively. I think I have seen samples of almost every race in the world. I have seen samples of men in all sorts of conditions, but I confess to you that the more I travel and the more

I observe, the stronger is my admiration for the negro. After being absent from the United States for about a year, not a great while ago, I came into the port of San Francisco and was met by a negro friend, and my wife said that I forgot all about her and turned her over to the customs officers, and for a long time she was in despair as to whether she would get me to the hotel. I had been feeling pretty lonesome without him. Now, my position in regard to this matter is also strengthened, and it amounts to a strong conviction with me, because I believe so thoroughly in the *ability* of the negro. I do not think there ever was any thought more superficial than this about his not having, except in possibly a few isolated instances, that sort of ability that qualifies him for the larger affairs of life. When you consider his history and his advantages and the circumstances under which he has been evolved up to the present state, he has displayed amazing ability. I do not know of any class of men more capable of managing their own affairs than the negroes. This is the thought I would emphasize with all possible force. I have lived a large part of my life in the capital town of one of the principal negro States of this country. I know it to be a fact that as bankers, and as merchants, and as presidents of benevolent and fraternal orders, men of this race have displayed a variety of ability that is positively wonderful. You can cite many examples. In 1890, when the Constitutional Convention was in session in Jackson, Miss., there was a negro in that convention who was to me one of the most remarkable men I ever knew. So far as that convention was concerned he was very modest, but I frequently heard our citizens in Mississippi say, who served with him on one of the most important committees, that he seemed to have almost a genius for discerning the right thing, and I think Senator George, who had more influence in framing that instrument than anyone else, shared that view. That man's personality and ability are so remarkable that he has built up around him a large town, one of the best ordered towns I ever new. It is entirely made up of negroes. Every municipal office is filled by a negro. The postmaster is a negro. I am told that the values of real estate in that immediate vicinity are so great that land can hardly be purchased at any price. I passed through the town recently and the streets were so congested with automobiles that traffic was almost entirely obstructed; and Isaiah Montgomery, because of his great ability and because of his integrity of character, because his respect for his obligations stands so high—I have been told that the banks of that section have taken one hundred thousand dollars of bonds secured by his own individual guarantee in order that he may be able to carry out some of his enterprises. Of course, I might refer to

others, but I shall not detain you with that. Take them in religious matters, and how wonderful they sometimes are. I recall very vividly just now a circumstance that impressed me deeply. On one occasion a very distinguished bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Church came to the city of Jackson, Miss. It was a great event in some respects, a momentous event, not altogether singular, but that occasion was in some respects unusual. A great many social functions were arranged for him among his own people, many of them living in elegant homes and very prosperous. After he had been there about a week, he went away and it was the occasion of constant talk. I remember how the white citizens enjoyed comment that the negroes in our immediate vicinity indulged in in regard to that occasion. Brethren, do not misunderstand me. I do not in any sense discount the work of the Methodist Episcopal Church. I do not think those of you who know me believe that I would be capable of this. You have done much and I appreciate what you have done, but I am thinking about impressions that I have received which go to strengthen me in the position I occupy. I call attention to this coincidence. Just about the time of the African Methodist bishop's visit—it was in the same year, I think, of this special occasion which impressed me much—Bishop Fowler came to Jackson to hold a Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was entertained not only in one of the most elegant homes in our town, but one of the most elegant homes in the country. I doubt if Bishop Galloway and I ever enjoyed anything more than we did the delightful relations with Bishop Fowler on that occasion. Always brilliant, at that particular time he was scintillant, and yet if he had not preached in the white Methodist Church on Sunday night he would have gone away from Jackson and scarcely anybody outside of a small circle of colored people would ever have known that he was in the city. If there was any sort of inspiration in the whole occasion for the colored people, I could not discern it. I have attended many Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South, and I always enjoyed the sessions; but I have realized that when those Conferences adjourned, while they should have been a great inspiration to these people, about the only thing that seemed to be remembered concerning them was that a white bishop or some white connectional officer was present and no negro had been put in a position that gave him prominence and influence among his own people. Now, I have no sort of objection, if you prefer this plan, that you shall continue this policy. I am not speaking against it. I am simply saying, because you seem to desire to understand my position, that I do not regard it as ideal. These people ought, in my judgment, to have that sort of independence, that sort of stimulus for ini-

tiative, that sort of opportunity, that sort of large view, that sort of freedom, freedom from discrimination that is necessarily paralyzing in its effects—and believing in them as I do I have every confidence to hope that, having this independence, they will work out a great destiny, and it need not interfere at all to prevent the white people of this country or the white people of any other section from giving them the most generous help. I am constitutionally opposed to speaking about matters which are not germane to the subject. So you must pardon me if I have spoken of some things that are not directly before us. The discussion has taken a wide range, and I say these things in order that you may understand the motives and influences which have determined my position in regard to this matter, and I am not willing to take any action that would seem to me to postpone that which I most earnestly hope may come about when we shall have a strong, influential Episcopal Methodism for the negroes of this country. If you ask me what I propose, I have nothing to offer other than simply this: That if we cannot agree as to this matter we can at least seek in all possible ways to diffuse and perpetuate the delightful spirit which has characterized us here in our deliberations, and I hope that there will be evolved a kind of practical coöperation that will do away forever with all this overlapping and needless waste. Unless we can come to a conclusion that will be so satisfactory that we can all throw ourselves into it heartily and enthusiastically, I prefer that matters should remain as they are.

W. N. Ainsworth: I do not know that I can contribute anything to the solution of the practical difficulties which we face in this Commission. As I have listened to the progress of this debate from day to day, my heart has warmed with the deepest desire that our people shall be one people. As I have knelt before the throne that is high and white and Him that sits upon it, I have fervently prayed that God will fuse both of our Churches into one Church before the urgency and the magnitude of our common task. I wish that our people might be a homogenous people from New England to the prairies of the Lone Star State and from the Golden Gate of the West to the Empire State of the South. I could wish, Mr. Chairman, that the time might come, and I believe it will come before my day is over, when there shall be one General Conference in American Methodism; when Georgia shall be as profoundly interested in the Conferences in New York as she is interested in the Conferences in Alabama; when the Conferences in Minnesota will be as deeply interested in the Conferences in Mississippi as Mississippi is interested in the Conferences of Alabama. And, Mr. Chairman, the great task that lies out before us is a task that demands the uni-

fication of our forces. The presence of ten million people of an alien race, ignorant, childish, and immature for the most part, constitutes at once our chief difficulty and our gravest problem. One thing, however, we must both do if we are to be real members of the Church of Jesus Christ: we must seek to find the will of God with reference to our relationship to this problem and these colored people. Beyond all doubt, the great providential design in bringing these Africans here was their Christianization, and, it seems to me, without undertaking to be a prophet, the door to the continent of Africa must be opened by us with the key that Providence has put in our hands in our relation to this negro that is in our midst. If we be real Churches of Jesus Christ, we must seek to find the will of God in this matter and come into fellowship with his ultimate purpose as it relates to this people and this world-wide work to which they are related. But, Mr. Chairman, the practical problem which presents itself is this: The instrumentality by which these people are to be saved and brought to their place in our own civilization and to their part in the evangelization of the world is the gospel of Jesus Christ. Neither law nor proclamations nor amendments to constitutions will furnish the power that will make them free, and I am not disposed to confound the exercise of ecclesiastical privileges with the enjoyment of privilege and place in the kingdom of God. These two things do not necessarily go together. Some seem to think that ecclesiastical offices and the exercise of the privileges of government are necessary to the enjoyment of a place of privilege in the kingdom of God, but such is not the case. The bringing of the gospel to these men who are in our midst must largely be done by the people in the section in which they live. It must be done, brethren, by those of the white Church who are most closely associated with them in daily life. I quite agree with Dr. Penn when he says that the thing that is most needed for lifting the negro to his place in our civilization is for the white people of the South to be immediately behind the efforts of the Church for the evangelization of this race. It is most needed for the negro and it is very deeply needed for us. And, Mr. Chairman, it is fortunate that, in the providence of God, this problem is at last to be wrought out here. It is fortunate that in this section there are few others of an alien race outside of the ten millions of negro population. It is happily true that scarcely at any time has any form of infidelity taken root among the people of the South. We are largely a people of evangelical Protestant faith, and it is possible for me to show you by reference to the early charter and constitution of Methodism that more than any other Methodism that exists in the world to-day the Methodism of the South has adhered to the charter that was given to us by the

fathers. It is exceedingly fortunate that this problem is at last to find its solution under these conditions and at the hands of a people whose faith is undefiled. The people of the South began to discharge their duty toward this race and seriously to seek a solution of these difficulties years before the Civil War. The Civil War came; and, regrettable as it was, it came in the providence of God. It resulted in the termination of a system which has passed away forever and for which every one of us is glad. The people of the South did not entirely cease their efforts in behalf of the race, but they did lose much of the enthusiasm which they had had in the pursuit of this purpose of evangelization, and there were reasons for it. We have done something since the war. Witness the fact that millions of dollars are appropriated annually by the legislatures of the South, and they are legislatures of white men, and increasing millions are appropriated by these legislatures for the enlightenment and uplift of the colored people. Very considerable sums of money that do not enter into the records of any Church are contributed by the people of the South for the upbuilding of churches and for the support of the institutions of our colored people. I dare to say, and I cite one case which is in no wise exceptional, that the distinguished gentleman of Savannah and a Georgian of the Georgians, at whose house we were entertained on Friday evening, has aided in the erection of every colored church that has been built in this city for thirty years; and while I cannot speak with accurate knowledge of the figures because he himself is a modest man and lets not his right hand know what his left hand doeth, I am morally certain that several thousand dollars of his earnings as a lawyer have gone into the upbuilding of colored churches in this city. His case is not exceptional, but typical. There are men by the score in this city and in every other Southern city who are almost daily making their contributions for the work of the colored people in our midst. But, while we have done some things, and some things that have not entered into the records, there has been an abatement of our enthusiasm in the work that we would have done but for the unfortunate attitude of some of our brethren who have come from the North and have not wisely instructed the negro population in our midst. More than once instructors from the North have told the colored people of the South that the Southern white man has never really done any Christian work for him. You have contributed your labor, they tell him, through long years of slavery without any reward. I do not know that Dr. Penn in referring to that matter a moment ago meant altogether that. The labor that was rendered with great fidelity to the old masters in the Old South was not without its reward. Then, Mr. Chairman, more than once Northern

men have made the impression on us that they have undertaken to adopt the colored people of the South. We are your friends, they say, and these who are closest to you are not your friends. More than once colored men have been exhorted by men from the North to vote down the tickets that have represented the virtue and intelligence of the civilization of which we are proud. More than once men have taken great pains—thank God that day has passed away—to enable black heels to be put upon white necks. Far be it from me to make charges of this sort against all Northern men. Many of them have done the work of God among a needy race, but there have been specimens of unfortunate relations in this regard. I dare to say, with the deepest respect for Bishop Hamilton who sits before us and whom I always delight to honor, that it causes the people of my section to have pause in their desire for a close amalgamation of our Churches when they listen to remarks such as one that was made by Bishop Hamilton on Saturday afternoon, a remark which I believe was quoted, but which, I take it, came with his own approval—namely, “All the negro needs is a spelling book and the Good Book and the pocketbook to make him as good as any white man.”

E. C. Reeves: He didn't say that—I heard what he said.

Bishop Hamilton: I will not interrupt now. When you get through I will take about two minutes.

W. N. Ainsworth: I shall be glad for you to do it now.

Bishop Hamilton: No.

W. N. Ainsworth: Remarks of that sort, which seem to us to be extreme, give our people pause in their desire for unification. But, notwithstanding all these things, and the day of unhappy conflict that is happily passing away, we are getting, my brethren, to that mind and attitude that shall make us willing to undertake more seriously than we have ever done the discharge of our duty to this people. We must, as one great Methodism in this country, put ourselves behind the evangelization of the negro, and I believe that we will. We must come to the time at a very early day, and I pray God that before we have finished the deliberations of this Commission we shall find the means in some way whereby we can be a united Church behind these great problems that confront us both. The practical question is, What shall be the relationship of these negro Methodists to the Church if the Northern and Southern Methodist Churches shall come together? Two or three things are proposed. It is suggested that the negro be a member of and within the corporate body of the united Church, with absolute equality of privilege with any other man that is in it. That means, if I understand it, that every office of the Church that is open to any white man in the Church shall be open to him. I think the following of that idea to its logical

end would mean that there should be no separate Conferences, that there should be no separate congregations; and for my part, I do not see where it is any greater discrimination against the ecclesiastical equality of the colored man to have a separate General Conference than it is for him to be put apart in separate Annual Conferences and separate congregations. If, as some men argue, equality with the white man in the ecclesiastical organization demands that he shall be in the legislative body of the Church, it seems to me that same equality would demand that he should be in Annual Conferences and in local congregations with the white man, and yet perhaps not one of you of the Northern Commission is willing for him to have that relationship to your Church. If you were, the colored man himself knows that he would under those provisions of hypothetical equality in the Church be for all time a ward within the ranks of the great white Church because we all know that the white people with superior intelligence and superior resources would dominate that Church. The white man would control all its administrative affairs. The negroes would continually be denied bishops, they would not be given to any large extent responsible connectional offices, they would be wards in the Church and would be discriminated against throughout the future years just as they are now being discriminated against in the Methodist Episcopal Church. The other suggested relationship is that they should have independence. My Church prefers that they shall have independence in that sense that they shall be put into an entirely separate Church either by themselves or in union with some of the already existing negro Churches. We recognize that it will take time to accomplish that result; but, for my part, I shall be willing for them to be placed in a separate General Conference with some kind of bond or nexus between the two. I deeply believe that it is to the welfare both of the white and the negroes that there shall be a very close relation between the two in the administration of the affairs of this negro Church, and I am inclined to believe that such an arrangement will prove to be even better than entire independence. The Associate General Conference would give closeness of fellowship and some kind of mutual direction of the joint interests of these two races and these two Churches. We overlook one fact, it seems to me, in all our discussions, and it is this—*i. e.*, that mechanical union is not necessary to a perfect fellowship and the most generous help. Some men seem to think that the closest mechanical union is essential to Christian fellowship and brotherly love. I do not understand it that way. We can extend the finest fellowship and give the largest help in the development of negro Conferences without our being bound together in the very closest ecclesiastical relationship. I must

come to a conclusion of my remarks by saying that in some way the Methodist Churches of the North and of the South must be united behind the great problems that a new day in the world's history is going to bring to us. At the same time Southern men, realizing that all the institutions of the world are being thrown into a melting pot, that there are voices on every hand appealing for a new socialism, for new theories of government that do not attract the people of the South, feel it is not wise for us to do anything that may jeopardize the institutions that, at the largest expense, we have been building through the generations. We do not feel that we can well afford to give an equal share in the control of our institutions of either Church or State to men who have but for a few brief years emerged from slavery and are not yet prepared for such responsibility, yet we are at one with you in the desire to put our shoulders by your shoulders and link our arms with your arms that we may be fused into one before the magnitude and urgency of the missionary task to which God calls us in our relation to this race and to all the other peoples of the world. May God's good Spirit bring us to find his ultimate purpose and to enter into fellowship with him, each of us seeing eye to eye in the accomplishment of our mission!

Bishop Hamilton: I again rise to a question of personal privilege, and I purpose, if you please, to keep within only my parliamentary privilege, because I appeal to the record again as I did yesterday. I hold it in my hand and I propose to read it. Let me first say to all of you brethren that I have arrived at an age, if nothing else had to do with it, and have had experience all through this country in traveling over all sections and in being entertained in all classes of your homes, too much to allow anything that is said here or anything that is uttered in your newspapers to ruffle my spirits. I say my prayers before I come here, and I love all my brethren just as much when I am away from here as when I am here. At first I declined to speak out there, and told my brother who asked me, to get somebody else, and we were nearly there when he came into my auto and requested me to speak. I never rise to speak on any occasion that I do not first of all, if I am to address intelligent people, as I usually do, without some sort of mental preparation, and I never want to leave any place without leaving some word that I pray God will be helpful to the persons who hear me. Now, I will not say what I did say. I am simply going to appeal to the record as I did yesterday. But first of all, it is my misfortune here in the South, and with you Southern people, to have come from New England, to have been eight years in charge of the educational work among the colored people, and to have spoken far and near after the fashion of my friend Burns, that "A man's

a man for a' that," and, therefore, every time I rise to speak there seems to be a presupposition or a prejudgment that I am in favor of social equality or that horror of miscegenation, and everything that I say seems to be interpreted through those glasses. I simply read to you yesterday from the record, and I propose to do it now. Do you remember the important thing that I said to this company of black boys after saying how proud I was in this State, that after sixty years a State that had forbidden by law each of them from receiving a letter was now teaching them—do you remember what was the prominent thought? Did I not say, "First seek the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and then all you may hope for is promised to you"? Did I not say that no man could be a scholar who did not know his Bible? Did I not say that no man could be a best citizen who was not a Christian? Now, let us read. This is what the paper said:

The Bishop quoted some one as having made the statement that the negro given the spelling book, the Good Book, and the pocketbook, would be as good as the white man.

Is there any man in this Conference who will deny that statement? When you have eliminated your preconception of me and my former associations, and what I might have said or could have said, is there any man here who thinks that when you give the black race the spelling book and the Good Book and the pocketbook, he may not become before God and the Christian Church as good as a white man? I will stick to the record, but don't put on me anything I didn't say. This brother (Judge E. C. Reeves) was right by my side, and he said, "Bishop, you never said anything like that." I was just encouraging a lot of black boys to be good, and God knows no people have ever had just such relations as those people have had. Now, take your paper and say if the black man with those things cannot be just as good before you and me and God and Christianity.

W. N. Ainsworth: I crave one word. There were many who regarded the remarks of Bishop Hamilton as quoted capable of an interpretation that might not be best in our community life. His language, at least by implication, contained the germ of a doctrine that we would not like the leaders of our Church to teach. I hope not a word will be said about it anywhere else than in this room. Some little has been said about it in the city, but, for one, I have sought to allay any feeling upon the subject, and I am most happy to say that while I thought Bishop Hamilton's remark was unfortunate, I knew that his heart was in the right place and in no sense does it affect my regard for him.

Bishop McDowell: A question of personal privilege. Bishop Hamilton does not need at my hands or at the hands of any other

person any defense. But I rise as one of the Commissioners to say that I am a little overweary of these that seem to me rather personal attacks upon Bishop Hamilton and his sayings.

Bishop Leete: I want to express my indorsement of Bishop McDowell's remarks.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Don't trifle with the question of privilege.

Bishop Leete: May I finish what I have to say? I think in all due courtesy, to say nothing of Christian ethics, there ought to be such an interpretation placed by the last speaker as to what he has just said as will not leave Bishop Hamilton in any position that might be misunderstood. I think that is due Bishop Hamilton.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Inasmuch as this has gone as far as it has, I am going to recognize Judge Reeves, and I no longer recognize any personal privilege matter.

W. N. Ainsworth: I want to rise to a question of personal privilege first. In the remark I made a short time ago I think I quoted Bishop Hamilton accurately. I regarded the remark he made as an unfortunate one. I do so still. It does not affect in the slightest degree my personal regard for Bishop Hamilton, though. I know that his integrity and character and his purpose are beyond question, and I love him as a brother in Jesus Christ.

E. C. Reeves: I heard the remarks of Bishop Hamilton and I heard the quotation this morning, and sitting at the table with Bishop Candler I said that was an injustice to Bishop Hamilton. While the words quoted are the words he uttered as quoting from another, it does not give what he stated in advance or what followed, and I heard what he said and I know that he intended the whole thing as an encouragement for the black children to work up to the situation that was occupied by the white and that the whites were held up rather as a model trying to encourage those poor children to work up to the model. I never once thought—it never entered my mind that he was thinking about any such thing as negro equality that we have heard so much about. When Bishop Hamilton uttered those words, I said in my heart "Amen," and if I am not a Southern man it is impossible to make one by the grace of God or by the Southern Confederacy.

Claudius B. Spencer: This is very entertaining, but it does not seem to sustain any particular relation to the business before us and I move that everything concerning it be stricken from the journal.

Bishop Hamilton: I hope that will not be done. Here is a public statement in the newspaper, and I have a right to be heard; and if anybody goes out from here and says what Brother

Ainsworth said, I want a fair privilege on the record, nothing fairer than a fair representation.

W. N. Ainsworth: Personally, I shall be quite willing for you to strike my whole remarks from the record. I did not think this allusion would attract as much attention as it has. I did not mean to refer to Bishop Hamilton's remarks in any sense except as remarks that somebody might make a little unfortunate, and I shall be very glad if you will strike from the record all reference to it.

Rolla V. Watt: That is a part of the record of this meeting, and I am strongly opposed to leaving it out. It is unfair to Bishop Hamilton, and is represented in the minutes now in accordance with what has taken place.

A. J. Lamar: I take the same position that Brother Watt does. You get the minutes in inextricable confusion if you strike out certain parts that are based on certain other parts. You can't keep a correct record except by recording everything that is actually said. I fully sympathize with the brothers who want to correct statements that they have made in the Commission. I very frequently preach my decidedly best sermons at night when I cannot sleep, Sunday night, and get to thinking about what I said in the morning and wishing I had put it otherwise. I make a speech in the Commission and I look at the transcript of it afterwards and I say to myself, "Well, that is all right, but I could state that a great deal better than it is stated there," but I never feel at liberty to change a thing that I have said; and when the Secretary of this body submitted to me after the Baltimore meeting a record of the remarks I made, I wrote back and told him that I wished I had done better, that I believed that I was capable of doing better; but that was a correct record of what I said as well as I could remember, so let it stand. Now, if you go to correcting records and change the substance of any statement that any man has made here, it results in confusion. One brother may listen to the speech of another brother and make a response to it and make statements based on it, and then when someone is reading that speech and sees that such statements are based on the speech of the other member and turns back to the other member, he does not find it, because it has been stricken from the record. I say an inextricable confusion will result from changes of that sort. I think any man has a right to correct verbal and grammatical inaccuracies in his statements, but I do not believe that he has the privilege of touching in any way the substance of what he said in this body.

Bishop Cooke: I am personally willing that all this shall be stricken from the record, providing that what is printed in the newspapers and the impression sought to be made shall also be

stricken out from the paper. The paper stays. It goes on file. It may be referred to hereafter for various purposes. There will be nothing in the record to correct the false impression sought to be made, and for that reason I do not think it is justice to Bishop Hamilton and justice to this Commission that this matter shall be stricken out.

A vote being taken, the motion to strike out was lost.

C. M. Bishop was recognized by the Chair, and on motion of Bishop McDowell, duly seconded, the time was extended until Dr. Bishop could finish his remarks.

C. M. Bishop: Most that I desire to say has already been said by other brethren. So far as I had in mind any constructive plans, they were suggested in substance by my colleagues, Dr. Chappell and Dr. Reynolds, yesterday afternoon, better than I could have put them myself. There had been no collaboration between us, but our minds had been moving in the same direction. I would not take your time now at all, except for the purpose of introducing a slightly different standpoint, and of throwing all the light upon this subject that can be brought to bear. I suppose we are all a good deal alike. We are so impressed by these various addresses and forms of argument that upon occasion our spirits are bright with hope as we listen; and then upon other occasions, whatever our convictions may be, the prospects look dark and gloomy. I confess that under the influence of some of these addresses I myself have at times been almost ready to ask the question, "What is it all for? Will anything worth while come out of it at last?" And yet, I am absolutely sure that if each man had now the right and opportunity to say just what he himself looks for in the future, perhaps, after thinking for a moment, he would say, "Out of all this there cannot come anything less than coöperation and coördination among the Methodists of this nation, for the long years of the future and the big tasks of the future, in a brotherhood more glorious than we have ever known before." I really think that in the most discouraging moment unification is still the uppermost purpose in all our minds. Some of the phrases do not sound that way, but the hearts all beat in that direction. Yesterday, while two of these distinguished gentlemen were speaking, I was the victim of varying emotions. As Dr. Lamar spoke describing the situation in the South—and I agreed with him as to most of the facts which he set forth and their significance—I was sitting here in my place staring blankly at the west wall of this room, when my eyes finally focused on the placard hanging there, which very properly said, "We can do it if we will." It came as an answer to a note almost of despair. And when my distinguished friend Bishop Cooke was analyzing from a distance Southern ethics

and identifying it with German ethics in these days, I then forced myself to lift my eyes again to that same placard on the wall, "We can do it if we will"; and then I elevated them just a little higher to where it says "This year, 1918." And I think we can. We are working at a task at which we dare not fail. The Churches would hold us up to obloquy. My distinguished friend, I think it was the other day, said, and I thought he was speaking the truth, concerning the photograph of this Joint Commission which had been made—he said, "This is a historic occasion, and the group will be of historic value in years to come." I hope it may. But it would be a shame to have one's face in that group if we should quit or fail or go back saying there is not enough religion in Methodism nor enough wisdom in Methodist statesmanship to grapple the problem that has come into our hands and must be handled now, and solved as the future demands, and as the present makes possible; and not as if the past, bitter as much of it is, ruled us to-day. Are we to live forever under the shadow of reconstruction and of the injustice and the wrongs which we and our fathers suffered here in the South? Are we to have our blood burning forever with the fires that flame out of those remote days? I refuse to be the slave of the enmity that burned against my people, if there was such enmity. It shall not find in me its mark. I have gotten away from it. I do not even think it was enmity. It was misunderstanding and ignorance. That is what it was, but I will not be its victim. I live for this day and the days that are to follow it and grow out of it. This is "*the day*." I wonder if this may not be the day of transition from those other days, so black and crowded with cares and in which there was much fraternal warfare—I wonder if these twenty-four hours might not be the day of transition from that shadowed land of the past out into a land that is wide and bright and full of opportunity for vigorous achievement in the winning of this whole land of ours for Christ; lifting it socially, politically, and otherwise to the level of Christian conceptions. My dear Bishop, it is not characteristic of the South to *segmentize* its religion, to leave religion out of commerce and politics and social life and the rest of it. We do not believe in any such ethics as that. We have been teaching our children for I do not know how many generations—certainly all the generations I know of—better than that. We have misunderstood each other a little, you and we across the lines; but when you announce the big platform you will find that the men of the South can get on that platform with you. If it is narrow, and little, and segmentized, there is where we are apart; but when we conceive the problems before us in their largeness and final outcome, I declare that we are together in all of them that are of importance. What we are work-

ing at after all, therefore, is merely the perfecting of a plan. I think it is worth while to say that again, or I would not say it. But it must be the conviction of all the members of this Joint Commission now that, fundamentally, our hopes are the same, our outlook on the future is in large measure the same. In all the great undertakings of Christianity for the century upon which we have entered we can share in the most brotherly and coöperative way. Are we not better Methodists now than fifty years ago? I am sure we are as one of the consequences of these very associations which we are here enjoying. Are we not sure of each other as well as ourselves? Yes, we are sure now of ourselves. We have come to ourselves a little bit more completely. We are not so narrow, and we understand each other better. I have not the slightest idea that there is a man on this Commission from the North who does not agree that every Southern man on the Commission is sincerely concerned about the negro and his education and his Christianization, as well as his opportunity fully to secure his human rights. If there is an intelligent man in the South who does not desire the coming of the time when he shall have such fullness of opportunity, I do not know him. We have been working lamely at our task, God forgive us. And we have been praying, on our knees, for that forgiveness. I am sure I recognize more clearly than ever before that the Northern purpose, all through these years, has been more distinctly and clearly and strongly a living missionary purpose than we used to think it was. It was not easy so to conceive of it at first when we saw things from such widely different standpoints; but I beg to assure you that I do not know of any intelligent Southern man who does not now recognize the worth of that motive and its cleanness, and who does not say in his heart, as I have heard men say privately and publicly, that the people of the North and the Methodist Episcopal Church had done for the South a task in the education and uplifting of the negro for which all the generations to come would be in debt to them. We all know that we are nearer together. We are together as to principles. I do not allow any man to love the negro more than I do. I am a convinced, deliberate, intentional friend of the negro. I am his friend from principle, I know something of the sentiments which some of these brethren who are older have described. I came on a little later, but I recall that in my childhood something of the old relations remained, and I played with the children of my grandfather's slaves on the hillside and about the yard and in the orchard, and I know something of those feelings of friendship, that personal kind of friendship, which existed all over this country of ours; but I have a higher type of friendship for the negro now. I love him because I intend to love; because, as a Christian, as a Methodist,

and as a citizen of the South, I am going to do what I can with God's help to see to it that he has his chance to become a worthy citizen of the land I love and the nation to which I belong, and because I cannot conceive of my life having any very great purpose unless part of that purpose be the blessing of the man next door to me or in my own community, who has been under some misfortune to which he was born, but who is a child of God and saved by Jesus Christ. And it is not because we are lacking in sympathy with your missionary purposes concerning the negro, nor because we lack at all that personal love, that Christian love, for the negro that we are disposed to ask more careful and persistent attention to the plan of reorganization and the question of how the negro problem is to be solved, even when we have brought about unification. Shall it be a mere artificial sort of combination of opposites? Or shall it be a heartfelt coöperation of Christian forces which shall be more efficient in the service of the kingdom of God in these various sections of ours? Will the plan adopted enlist and increase the enthusiasm of the North? Will the plan adopted bring the white men of the South upstanding with a sense of a new opportunity? Will the plan adopted lift these colored men somewhat out of the unhappy limitations which they feel about them now? Will it lift them out of these limitations and somewhat set them free? Will it? These are not ideals too high for us to contemplate, are they? We should, somehow or other, accomplish such a unification of these Churches as will create renewed interest in the North and in these colored men down South. I told you a moment ago how I have learned to appreciate and value the motives with which you have sent your workers here. But I tell you now, the mere throwing of a coin to the victim struggling in the arena, the handing out to him of the prize he happens to win in the spectacular conflict, is not what we are here for. Not only for the missionary reason, but in view of all the sociological complications of the whole matter, North and South, America must somehow or other work out this most difficult and delicate problem of the assimilation and commingling of these strangely different races. Christianity must not be found to be an utter failure either with reference to the whites in their treatment of each other, or with reference to the negro in his own self-elevation, or with reference to the association of these two races together at all. And I beg to point out to you that this is not a mere academic question. What I mean by that is, you cannot settle it upon the basis of too wide and vague a generalization. The processes of history and the processes of social development are infinitely complex, and they involve the most delicate matters and imponderable influences. At times the best you can do is to follow the method

of the empiricists and work slowly along, finding out what you can from human experience in the past and from the testing of the principles which history brings to you. Whatever you can do will be done well, only as you yourselves work along in this human laboratory, slowly trying out experiments, making new experiments, and still forever experimenting, until after a while you shall have wrought out the problem. It is not to be solved in accordance with any established dogma. It cannot be worked out easily, because men say—all of us say—we have been saying for eighteen hundred years—that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners, to save all men. That gives a tremendous Christian impulse to our souls and a marvelous realization of the meaning of life to humanity; but you cannot jump under that great throbbing influence to a solution of this question at a single leap. These problems are rooted in the long, long processes of evolution. (I think that is both a more intelligent and a more religious mode of speech than simply to say, "This is a distinction God Almighty made.") These processes that reach back into the long centuries, we cannot overlook them. A social problem is never a simple problem; and the racial problem, the more one studies it the more perplexing he finds it. I thought, when Bishop Hamilton was speaking the other day, that there might be certain illustrations of that theory which perhaps would seem to hold good; but what do you think when you look at the Balkans? How are we impressed when we think of Austria-Hungary? What effect does it have upon the argument when we reflect upon the situation in Jamaica and Cuba and in Mexico, and some of the South American states? It does not confirm us in the optimistic belief that by the simple union of various tribes we would get at last the ideal man or the ideal country. Not by any sort of means; but rather it points out to us something else. It makes it clear that the thing is so complex that no easy rule will solve it. It has to be humanly worked out. Such is the situation we are in; and we of the South, brethren, you are utterly mistaken if you think we do not feel the dreadful perplexity of it and that we do not want to work it out for the best of all concerned. I have been a student of sociology. I am even teaching sociology now in the college where I labor, in the absence of the Professor of Sociology at the front in France; and I have gone through the books of our library and those which I possess, in the hope of finding somewhere light upon this particular concrete problem of ethnology, and I am bound to confess to you, the more I have studied it the more discouraged I have become about our American problem. I did not expect to be so discouraged. I thought that we only needed to know more, and I went about trying to find out more; and the more I found out, the more I was discour-

aged. I am not sure in my soul that we ever can work out to our thorough satisfaction the social and racial situation in America. The ethnologists, most of them, prefer to believe that races may be amalgamated without injury. The sociologists do also, and so do I; but I do not expect miracles in the physical world in this day. I think God has given to us a world in which we are to work out our own problems, but with very industrious hands and very completely engaged minds. And I think that in the long processes of the working out of the problems of humanity itself, God Almighty must give the finishing touches to the making of his child as the master sculptor turns at last with keener chisel and the lightest stroke to perfect the lines of grace of the nearly finished statue of which he had dreamed. I am willing to go into these long processes trusting in God. Let us take the chance. That is the way I was converted. I just took the chance. And that is the way I think we are going to be saved, taking the chance and God helping us. And we do not understand that to mean that we are just flinging ourselves recklessly ahead. We must be guided by all the intelligence and wisdom that we can bring under our command. You know the study of group relationships and of the movements of progressive groups is an intensely interesting thing. Some of you have read in a recent number of the *Nineteenth Century and After* an address delivered by an Anglican bishop under the title "Lawyers, Doctors, and Parsons." The most interesting thing he said was that in this great war lawyers, doctors, and parsons work together in the most splendid coöperation and with the enthusiasm that fires from rank to rank. But when they descend from the level of the great conception that lifts them all, Liberty and Freedom of the World and Righteousness in the World, and get back to the common places of life, lawyers and doctors and parsons—you can easily conceive of interests in which they would not coöperate at all. Why, here we are all coöperating the same way in this war. But when you raise the question of international law, what does the parson have to say, or what does the doctor have to say? Or when you introduce the subject of the skilled treatment of wounds received or of the victims of gas poison, what does the lawyer know about it? How could they combine and help each other to solve that? And when they tell us parsons what we ought to do with reference to religious treatment of the boys in our army, I confess that, while I listen in order that I may learn about what the doctors and lawyers think about the methods of religious teaching, I do not yield myself to their dogmas—because I have been thinking about that myself. That is my specialty. That is what I am in the world for. I am forced to carry out my own principles. And now I am radically afraid

that what we call race distinctions are so deep that we shall be forced as intelligent Christian men to make room for their recognition in laying our plans. I think we shall. It is not for me to say that that will necessarily turn out to be an unfortunate thing. But I will confess to you, Southern man as I am, Southern in the prejudices that were my inheritance and that constitute the atmosphere in which I lived during my youth, Southern in my devoted love for my land—I will confess to you that there have been times, and it was in the early times of our work as a Commission, when I thought and hoped that the solution of this question would place the negro in the General Conference of the Church, much in the same relation that he has now in the Methodist Episcopal Church. That looks like an easy solution, and I am not so sure about any very far-reaching opposition to it in the South as some of my brethren are. But I confess to you that I have become more and more doubtful as I have found out more about the negro and more about myself, and have given more careful consideration to the probable best mode of working out coöperatively the religious life of the South and the religious life of the white and black in the South. True, we are together in our devotion to Christian principles. We are sympathetic in our missionary impulses. We are alike in our sharing in all the grace that God himself so infinitely disposed on all his people. But when it comes to the matter of ecclesiastical organization we had better work in the lines we can work in as nature itself seems to have fixed those lines. We can combine for the great outstanding objects of the Church, but we cannot combine rightly in the election of bishops in the Church. It never has been done. You may utterly disagree with me, but I do not think we can combine in legislation. I believe negro leadership will be better for the negroes because it is more congenial and because better understood. Gentlemen, I do not know how my colored brother thinks. Neither do you of the North know. He does not know how I think. We, the white and black, are the various outcome of laws of inheritance which are only faintly beginning to be understood. But we are human beings. We are alike in the great fundamental things of life, in our fundamental need of grace, and in our hope for the best in this world and the next; and we can work it out as partners. I tell you that film of color which seems to spread forever between us as races is impenetrable to certain kinds of forces. But it offers no obstruction at all to Christian brotherhood. It offers no obstruction at all to helpfulness. It offers no obstruction at all to partnership and a share in all the things that are Christ's. Then, let us work along together with that impenetrable difference between us recognized by both, but with our hands stretched to each other

and our hearts full of love for each other. I am convinced that is the wisest thing to do. And somehow or other we must do it in one Church. Not for a moment do I agree with the view of setting up an independent negro Church. I would not consent to that. I do not think that is what the men of my Church really want, when you define the terms strictly. What I am sure my Church does want is to aid the negro all along the line. I believe we could organize a Church with two chambers, recognizing this difference, but with commissions of intercommunication and co-operation established between the two, and, so far as I am concerned, with equal membership rights from the General Conference all the way down. Then through these combining commissions as the agents of it, we might arouse Methodism everywhere to do its best work—far better work than it has ever done—for the negro and for the meeting of all the needs of our Christian civilization. In general terms that is my position, but I do not want to be misunderstood by anybody on either side.

E. C. Reeves: If we are going to have a meeting this afternoon, it is one o'clock now, we should adjourn.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The time was extended until Brother Bishop finished.

C. M. Bishop: I beg pardon for taking so much time, but I want to say again in closing that it must have been a kind of providence which hung that placard on the wall: "We can do it if we will; this year, 1918." I believe that this Joint Commission was appointed under the leadership of the Spirit of God. I will not yield at any step along the way to mere uncontrolled impulse and emotion. But holding my emotions under discipline as well as I can, and they almost burst out at times, so far as I am concerned I am deliberately setting myself in the direction of the union of American Methodism in behalf of America and of Christendom. And I think it can be accomplished.

Henry Wade Rogers: Just a minute before we adjourn. I rise to a question of privilege. I am sorry to say that circumstances compel me to ask the Conference to excuse me from further attendance on the sessions of the Conference. And in making that request, will you permit me to make an explanation of one thing that was said here on the floor to-day simply by way of explanation and not by way of argument? It has been said that there is objection to that provision in the preferential report which deprives the Associate Regional Conferences of the right to vote on constitutional questions. I simply want to call attention to the reason why that was introduced. We have created in that preferential report five Associate Regional Conferences, supposed to be Missionary Conferences. The present Constitution of the Methodist Episcopal Church provides in express language that

Missionary Conferences shall not have the right to vote on constitutional questions, and that is the reason that provision is incorporated in there. It is not intended to, and the preferential report does not take from the colored man who sits in the General Conference the right to vote on constitutional questions so long as he is in the General Conference; but it does take away from the Associate Regional Conferences, as it is the fundamental law of our Church that Mission Conferences shall not vote on constitutional questions now. In going away, I am very sorry, more so than I can tell you, that I go away before this question upon which we are spending so much time in the way of discussion comes to a vote. Nothing would have pleased me more, if circumstances permitted me, than to stay here with you until this question was satisfactorily disposed of. We can do it if we will, and we are going to do it. We shall, we will do it. So I beg of you not to adjourn until you have done it. With my kindest greetings to the members of the Commission from the South, whom I have come to know and to respect and to love, I take my departure most regretfully.

Bishop McDowell: It is known, of course, that Judge Rogers occupies a position of great responsibility and public importance and that his time is not his own. We regret more than we can tell that Judge Rogers is obliged or feels obliged to ask to be excused, and we know he would not have done it but from a sense of obligation and compulsion. I rise to move with great personal regret, but nevertheless in accordance with his wish, that we excuse Judge Rogers from further attendance upon the sessions of the Joint Commission at this time with an expression of our appreciation of his presence and work with us thus far.

P. D. Maddin: I would like to second Bishop McDowell's motion, and I second it with very much regret. Judge Rogers has rendered most eminent services on this Commission, especially on this question. He has given it deep thought and consideration. I believe if he can, within the limits of his time, remain another day he may enable us to agree upon it; but if he must leave, we bid him Godspeed with the greatest regret that we cannot have him through it all, but his work will live throughout the organization and will speak for the splendid services he has rendered.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Chair is sure that if it is possible for Judge Rogers to remain it will be a great satisfaction to us. The only thing, however, is to put the motion to allow him to take his leave of Savannah when emergencies require.

Bishop McDowell: I do not think we should press Judge Rogers to the point of embarrassment.

Henry Wade Rogers: I will stay one day more. [Applause.]

A vote being taken, the motion to grant Judge Rogers leave of absence was carried.

Bishop Cooke: I rise to a question of personal privilege. I did not care to interrupt Brother Bishop during his address. I think it is an unparliamentary thing to do, but at the beginning of his address he made a statement that I compared Southern ethics with German ethics. Considering the moral character of German ethics, I think that is a very grave error. I neither compared nor did I liken Southern ethics to German ethics. I was analyzing. It is my habit to analyze. I prefer to analyze rather than to luxuriate in the fenceless fields of fancy or rely upon any sort of spontaneous eloquence which depends upon its memory for its rhetoric and its imagination for its facts. To attribute such a sentiment to me, loving the Southern people as I do and living among them all my life, honoring them and admiring them—why, such a thought never entered my heart nor soul, and I resent it profoundly—I repudiate it. I never had such a thought. In my estimation there is no people on the face of God's green earth more loyal and loving to the Lord Jesus Christ and to the highest aspect of his revealed religion than are the people of the South.

The session was closed with the benediction by Rev. A. J. Lamar.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The session was called to order by Bishop Mouzon.

Rev. Frank Neff conducted the devotional exercises.

The hymn, "Just as I am, without one plea," was sung.

The closing part of Ephesians iii., beginning at the fourteenth verse, was read.

Prayer was offered by Dr. Neff.

The roll was called, and the following were present: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke, Collins Denny, Edwin D. Mouzon, W. B. Murrah, James Atkins. Ministers: Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, Edwin M. Randall, Claudius B. Spencer, Joseph W. Van Cleve, John J. Wallace, F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, John M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar. Laymen: G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, H. W. Rogers, Alex. Simpson, Jr., R. V. Watt, C. M. Stuart, James R. Joy, Charles A. Pollock.

The journal of the morning session was read and approved.

W. J. Young: I do not know whether I shall be able to add anything to the discussion or not. It seems that nearly all has been said on this subject that may be said. Yet, I do feel that, as things are going now, every Commissioner ought, even though

briefly, to give some expression of his personal views upon those subjects that we have been discussing under the head of the Status of the Negro in the Reorganized Church. And it is my desire this afternoon simply to put on record what my own individual views are at the present time. And I suppose I ought, with all the rest, to start with the assurance that I believe with all my heart in unification, and think that we should do everything in our power to bring about the reunion of the two great branches of Methodism in the United States; and I do not feel that we shall have done our duty unless it shall be evident at the close of these days that we spend together that we have expended every effort that we could possibly use in order to accomplish this thing. So far as my own Church is concerned, I have always believed that my General Conference was perfectly sincere in the unanimous expression of its desire to bring about the unification of Methodism in the United States. I feel that the Church meant every word it said upon that occasion; and I further believe that the great mass of our Church, so far as it has paid attention to the great subject before the Church, is to-day in harmony with that action. There are differences of opinion in our Church, varying largely with locality, as to what may be the proper method to bring this about. I think, as it has been said so often, and perhaps it cannot be said too often just at this time, there are special reasons why we should do everything we can to accomplish this end in these days of stress and strain in our national life. In the midst of union upon every other basis it seems pitiful that the Churches—not only these two branches of the Christian Church, but all other branches of the Christian Church—should not come into closer fellowship one with the other. I have been doing a great deal of service myself in the camp which is near to the city where I now live. It has pained me beyond measure again and again as I have gone out to preach to the men that I have to do my work under the auspices of the Young Men's Christian Association. Not that I have been troubled with that fact in itself, but with the fact that it seemed to be impossible for the Church as an organization to do this work in the various camps among the soldiers of our country, and that the Church, even through those appointed by the Church for this service, just because it is so much divided, must do this work through another organization. Oh, I know that the Young Men's Christian Association is a Church at work and I know that the Young Men's Christian Association could not do the work if it were not for the Church; I know it could not do the work if it were not for the ministers of the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, but the Church as an organization is not doing the work because it finds it impossible to do the work. And I make another observation just at this time so far as my own Church is

concerned, that the Church must take a larger and wider view of its mission than any mere section presents to it. I believe my own Church must cast its eyes beyond that narrow outlook which it has given itself in the past. It largely depends on the view of the Church, the scope of its vision as to what it shall accomplish in the life of the world. Now, I believe, granting the regional idea in some form, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, will stand for unification as we have been working it out, provided the problem now before us can be properly settled. I think with us, to use the word so often used, that this thing we are now discussing is not the only crux. I believe the other thing is almost equally important. But granting that I feel quite sure that this is the only problem now in the way of a possible ultimate reunion—I do not mean to say it can come in a few days in the accomplishment of it—but I believe it will come finally as we may be able to settle this problem before us. So, I want to say a few words about that. First of all, I am not prepared like some of my brothers to make confession of the past sins of my own people in dealing with the negro as if they alone had sinned. When I heard my dear friend Dr. Blackwell, whom I have loved for years, telling what miserable offenders we have been, I felt very much as I felt the day I went forward as a child to kneel at the altar in a church revival. Some old saint whose name I never knew, because I had at that time the idea that it was criminal even to lift my eyes, patted me on the back and wanted me to make confession of my sins very much like a chronic jailbird. I remember how, on that occasion, I resented even the suggestion. I knew I was a sinner and had done many things that I ought not to have done, but I had not done all the things he wanted me to confess, and I did not then and I do not now intend to make confession of sins I have never committed. So, I have felt as to some of the criticisms that have been bestowed upon the South and especially upon my Church now and in the past. I know we sin—yes, all of us—and fall short of our duties to God. I do not know that one part of the country has sinned more than any other part. That is my honest statement, and I reflect on nobody's intention. It is a statement of what, after many years of thought and contact with this problem, I am convinced is true. I want to say, as far as I am personally concerned—and in stating my own work I am stating the work of other men and not stating it simply because it is work that I have done—I want to say that, barring the fact that in this and all other matters I personally may not altogether have performed my duty as I might, I do feel standing here that I have done all that I might have done, under the circumstances, for my colored brother. I have knelt at the bedside of their sick and dying. I have preached for them and aided them in their own churches.

There has scarcely been a Sunday in any city church that I have served in Virginia that I have not had some of them in my congregation. I remember once a group of school-teachers (graduates of universities in New England) had come from the North to teach in the schools of my city, and one representative came and asked me if they might attend services at my church, because they did not find in the church of their own denomination a preacher who might be helpful to them. I brought the matter before my Board of Stewards. I knew what they would say. That church had no gallery, so they were given the three or four pews from the front, and during the whole of that school session they were among my most earnest and appreciative listeners; I have had them in the study of my home to give them advice; I have loaned them my books, and they have shown themselves like my white brethren sometimes in that they did not return them. In various ways I have tried to minister to them because my heart made me want to minister to them and because my dear mother taught me that there was an obligation on me to help them morally and spiritually, to give them an uplift which they so much needed. And so far as the section of the country which I here represent is concerned, it has done vastly more than it has ever been given credit for. I heard the interesting figures read here to-day by Dr. Penn, whom I greatly respect. I was the pastor for four years of that Court Street Church to which he refers and know very well the people who meant so much to him in his boyhood days. Permit me to say that I believe with all my heart that if you could add up the sums of money that have been given by the Southern Methodists—not as an organization always, but as individuals—to the churches and the buildings of institutions constructed by your Church I am firmly convinced that it would fully equal all the amounts reported as having been given by your Church to the work of the colored people of the South. I have again and again given letters of introduction to your preachers to move among my members, heading the subscription list with my own name to give force to my recommendation, and pleaded for them from my pulpit. What difference did it make to me or my people that they represented the Methodist Episcopal Church? They were our wards, we owed an obligation to them, and we were glad to render them the assistance that they called for. I think our preachers have preached for them as far as they have had opportunity. Our people in the South have done a great deal for the educational work of the colored man. It meant a great deal, brethren, more than you know, the sacrifice that has been required in order to establish schools both for the white and the colored people in the South. Our people are getting better off now, but they came out of the war with nothing. They were poor. They were faced by problems very grave and very diffi-

cult of solution, and we have never gotten credit in the great summing up for the work that has been done for the betterment of the negro through the States which, after all, have done that because of the impulse given by the Churches which have stirred the States to a sense of their obligation, and opened the coffers of the State to the helplessness of these people. They have attended our churches and they still attend our churches—not in large numbers, but pardon me if I venture the assertion that they are far more frequent attendants upon the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, than they are upon the white Methodist Episcopal Church. And you will not misunderstand me when I state that our churches can much more easily open our doors in the proper way to such of their people as desire to come. We are not in danger of being misunderstood. Nobody will believe that we are trying to create any sort of improper equality from the standpoint of our Southern ideals, and so it is quite a common thing to have them present in our churches upon the Lord's day. And we have been helpful to the institutions they represent, and we have had institutes among them. Our good Home Mission Secretary, who sits before me, has done splendid work in that respect. Many of us have given our names and personal efforts to him to use in any way and at any time he saw fit, and without any remuneration, of course. We may go to different assemblies of preachers in the South and teach them how to preach and teach them other things they need to be taught, and do what we can to bring new inspirations into their lives. And, my brethren, I want to say this: that you men will never know how much the better type of negro in the South owes to the influence of the white men of the South for what culture and what manhood he has. For these colored men on the Commission, my brethren, I have the greatest honor and respect. I know the people to whom Dr. Penn refers. They are among my dearest friends. There are no people I love better. I could have told you before he told you that if he went to Lynchburg and called upon them for anything they would have responded. When I was pastor there and Dr. Penn came to the city to talk to the Colored M. E. Church, I knew there would be a falling off in my church that morning. I want to say to you that he owes more to the refinement that came out of that noble home than he owes to all your churches together. And you forget that the noblest men among the colored people are the very ones who have had what he has had, and that is a thing that is most frequently forgotten. We are all sinners alike, and I say it without hesitation. I have sinned, and my Church has. I am willing to make full confession of all the sins of which my people have been really guilty. I am not saying this here only. I have said it in every place where it was worth while to say it. I have preached it from the pulpit, and I

have pleaded with my congregation to do more for the colored people. Brethren, have the people of the North done their whole duty? Have they done their whole duty in the widest sense to the race with whom you come in touch? Do you not feel, as I am sure I feel about myself and about my Church, that you have scarcely touched the problem? The negro is not the only down-trodden race, if you want to use that word. The negro is not the only submerged man in the country. But, has the Methodist Episcopal Church carried out its own ideals with regard to the colored man? You started out with certain ideals, with some of which I did not agree, but all honor to the men who have stood for them. While I disagree with them, I have no doubt of their sincerity and honesty. But let me ask kindly but firmly, Have the ideals you have stood for in your relation with the negroes of the South been carried out? I do not think so. Some of your men have chided us for not sanctioning these things. Have you done the things for which you have stood? I say here this afternoon that if an ideal is worth anything it applies alike from the top to the bottom. You have no right to limit it. You have no right to say it applies to the General Conference of your Church and not anywhere else. If the principle is right, it applies to everything that concerns the negro and your relation to him. And what has been left, after all? I remember a very dear friend of mine who went to Chattanooga as a professor. He went like a hero to labor in the university at the time when it was putting forth an effort to bring together the races in that school. I remember very well when he came back. He came back a wiser and sadder man. The principle was not accomplished. Why should it not be accomplished if the ideal was correct? I cannot see for the life of me why it should not be. What is left, after all? You have divided Conferences and divided congregations. In fact, in the South you have fewer negroes attending the services of your Southern white churches, hearing the white preachers, than we have. You have divided congregations, and now you have nothing left but a small representation in the General Conference. If I were a negro, feeling as these good men whom we have already come to respect, I would have stood long before this and said with Dr. Jones, "If these principles are correct, I will stand to the crack of doom before I will budge an inch in the surrender of any of them." So, I say we have all sinned, and the negro himself has sinned. He has forgotten in many cases the people who meant most to him. They are not to us what they used to be. In my home we never have a servant who does not come in to family prayers. We will not have one who will not, and my wife goes into the kitchen—pardon these personal references—and stands by the side of the cook and talks to her about Jesus Christ and points her to the Lamb of God that taketh

away the sins of the world, and finds out what kind of a life she is living if she can. And yet how often, even after she has waited on her with her own hands in cases of sickness and attended to her with the care of a mother for a child, she has packed up her goods and left the house without even saying good-by. Those things are common. The most cultured and best educated of the negroes are constantly forgetful and unappreciative of what they owe to their white neighbors. Then it is sadly true that often the negro who is highest up does very little for the negro lowest down; just exactly as you find among the white people how many times it happens that we do not ourselves touch the lowest stratum of our social life. Dr. Jones says we do not know the negro. I do not know how it is with these two men. I wouldn't attempt to say, but I know it is true that the vast majority of men of their type I have met among the colored people know less about the masses of their people than many white people know, and for reasons that are evident. It is one of the pathetic things to-day. The men in the seminary where I teach go in and out among the colored people to learn what their problems are and sit down and talk about them. I wish I had the thesis which I read just shortly before I left on "The Program for the Kingdom of God." I wish I could read the paragraph bearing on the negro problem. It shows the high standard which the writer lays down for himself and the Church and is an insight into the situation and the responsibility that rests upon the South. There is not a Young Men's Christian Association where they are not studying out of textbooks by writers admitted by the colored people to be experts on this question. It is not true that our best white people do not know. They do know, and they are finding out more and more. May I say more than that? May I say, in my judgment, I think the negro workers in the A. M. E. Church are doing very noble work? I hesitate to make the comparison, but so far as the great masses are concerned, I believe the Independents are doing the better service. You have a splendid aristocracy of negro life in the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South. I do not say it is altogether made up of those by any manner of means; but that is where I have found them, and these noble men of whom Dr. Penn has spoken have rendered great service to your Church, and your Church deserves great credit for what has been done to train them—but these other Churches, humble as they may be, touch the masses even better. As to the method to be pursued in the solution of the problem I recognize the difficulty of the situation and, as I said a while ago, I recognize the conditions surrounding our two Churches. Do you suppose that any one of us does not feel the obligation, that it does not burden our thoughts, and that we do not think about it and talk about it? Do not

think that because we may want a different method of solution that we are any the less interested in the problem. Bishop Hamilton, it is not true, if your interpretation of the white man of fifty years ago be correct, that we are where he was fifty years ago. That is not true. No, we have gotten far beyond that. I believe the best thing that can be done for the colored man is an actual separation into an independent Church. I am saying frankly what I believe. One of my reasons for believing it is that the experiment of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the opposite direction has failed. You have not done what you started out to do. The ideals you and your best men entertained have never been achieved. It may be that it can never be done. It is at least evident that you are not able to do what you wanted to do. I believe there is a better chance for the negro to show capability of character and to develop to-day by ceasing to lean on the white brother for external help, and I believe the more he advances in the direction of independence the better he will be. I do not believe the white man has the hold upon him that he used to have. He has come to his own in the realization of his manhood, and he is standing alone because he realizes as he never realized before the greatness of his own mind and his own opportunity. I do not believe the preferential plan is the best way out of our difficulty, nor do I believe the other is the best way. I do not think we should cut ourselves absolutely off from the negro. I believe firmly that the two plans ought to be put up to my Church through the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. I believe that the General Conference should face this as one of its problems and say for itself which plan it believes should be adopted. It would not give me any trouble to sit in a body with ten or twelve colored men. That does not disturb me in the least. They held me in their arms when I was a child, and they rocked my cradle and sang me to sleep. I am not disturbed by contact with them; but at the same time I have grave doubts whether that plan would be adopted or approved by my Church, and I am not here to say that it will or will not. I am here to say that I believe the Church I represent ought to be permitted to say whether it will approve that plan if that is the only plan from the standpoint of the Methodist Episcopal Church by which this problem may be solved. My brethren, I have spoken out of my heart, but it is a heart of love. I believe firmly the day will come when we shall be together, because I believe it is right and I believe God in his own good time, if not now, will make these people one.

Edgar Blake: Permit a privileged question. I think at either Traverse City or Baltimore we provided that reserve delegates should be entitled to the privileges of the floor for the purpose of discussion. I cannot find that action in either report.

Bishop McDowell: I will find it for you.

Edgar Blake: Just to make sure of it, I want to say that we have a reserve member of our Commission present in the person of Dr. Stuart. He was with us all through the session at Traverse City and has been with us all through the sessions at Savannah, and what I want to do is to move that the privileges of the floor for the purpose of discussion be extended to the reserve delegates. I so move.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

E. C. Reeves: I am prosaic in my speech. If I carried with me a quiver full of adjectives, like my colleague, Dr. Du Bose, and wished to ornament all the sentences I uttered and polish them and make them shine like Parian marble; and if I had at least sixteen words that I could select from every time to express an idea, instead of being glad to get hold of only one, I, too, would soar into the azure blue, amid emerald fields and gossamer groves that lie among the dun and yellow clouds. But I have no voluminous vocabulary to draw from. I am happy that I can simply express myself in one word, and then, often, it is not a happy one. So you will forgive me if I utter some word in my talk that will grate a little, for I do not mean to offend anybody. I was born near the place where John Brown died and where his ashes were buried, like my friend, Brother Pollock; twice a brother—one in Christian fellowship, the other as a fellow traveler through Syrian sands.

Abram W. Harris: What do you mean?

E. C. Reeves: I am talking to a Sir Knight. We have taken the emblem which betokens that relation, as solemn as anything can be outside of the room of death. I respect him very highly, but I do not regret that I was not as fortunate as he, to be born near where John Brown's ashes lie. I was born in the Switzerland of America, or near the banks of the beautiful Watauga. My mother first saw the light on a farm on that river, where the patriots under Sevier and Shelby and Campbell gathered the day before they started across the Unaka to King's Mountain, where they fought the battle that turned the tide of the Revolution, and I have no regrets that I was born there. I want to say a few words, and I don't want you to misunderstand me. I want you to know the environments under which I have grown up, and that will throw some light, probably, on some views that I now entertain and will explain to you why I make some declarations I shall make. In 1849, at Brush Creek Camp Ground—that cherished place is now within the limits of my home town of Johnson City—I was born anew. Possibly I am the oldest Methodist that belongs to this Commission, though not the oldest in years. Time moved apace. The war came on. Unfortunately our section was the worst divided country that was in the United

States of America, between the people who lived there, with reference to the Union and the Confederacy. My father and all the family except myself were Unionists. I alone was a Rebel. I went into the Rebel army. It is not offensive to me to say that I was a Rebel, for I was. All I lacked of being a patriot was that the Confederacy failed; that was all. My father and my brothers would have been Tories if the Confederacy had succeeded. As it was, they were patriots. When the thing wound up I was a Rebel. The worst day's work that Southern Methodism ever did was when their Holston Annual Conference persecuted Union preachers, men of Eastern Tennessee, and drove them from our Church. I recognize the fact that they were persecuted. I didn't help to do it. I had no voice in the Church. I was in the army. About one-half of our Holston Conference preachers were Union men, and they were persecuted wrongfully. Time, it is said, evens up all things; but sometimes it comes with full measure, pressed down and running over; and so it came to my Church. When I came out of the war, my Church was prostrate, and was the special object of mob violence. Our church buildings were in the possession of the Union Methodists; and it was no trouble at all for them to organize their Holston Conference, and I did not blame them for so organizing. I never blamed my father and family for going from, and he never blamed me for remaining in, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. We never fell out because we belonged to different Churches. I refer to this because I want you to know of the times of passion and persecution through which I lived. What I want to get at is this, to let you know how I became attached to my Church through her persecution; that it was a crucifixion to my feelings ever to agree to have unification on any terms. I am frank. That is a fact. I went out one time to hear one of your preachers, Brother Drake of Ohio, who held forth where my Church membership was. Mr. Drake told how the Southern Methodist Church was absolutely dead, on account of disloyalty, and would never be reorganized; and that now there was none but the loyal, old Mother Church remaining. I listened to him, but I didn't say anything, as a bunch of ex-Union soldiers were present; but I did a whole lot of thinking. Mr. Drake went to my father's to dine. At the dinner table Mr. Drake said to my father: "Brother Reeves, that was a glorious meeting. I held up the class book and said that any one whose name appeared therein who objected to going into the loyal Mother Church could make his objection known; none objected." I said: "Do you think I belong to your Church?" And he said: "Of course; you never objected." I said: "I never assented." He said: "Are you not going to remain a Methodist?" I said: "Yes." He replied: "Then you will have to go with us." I said: "No, sir; as long as E. C. Reeves lives there will be a Southern

Methodist Church, if it is composed of only one member." So you may correctly infer that it took me a long time to get rid of that feeling, for I am human. I was baptized afresh into my Church by persecution; but, thank God, all bitterness has passed away. To let you know a little more about the feeling that we had in my section, litigation followed over that very camp ground where I was converted in 1849, and where thirty-one years before that my father was converted. He and his brother were perhaps the leading laymen of the county in the Southern Methodist Church and both were trustees of said camp-ground property. When my father took his new Church relation, he was appointed a trustee for the Methodist Episcopal Church. Litigation followed between the two sets of trustees, and I was of council against my own father in the suit. Now, you can imagine something of the way we were divided. We passed through all those troublesome times, filled with the war spirit; but that is all gone, and if there is a more fraternal spot within the entire boundaries of the South than our Johnson City country I don't know it. I feel as free to go to the other church, and bow at the sacramental altar within their church, as I do in my own; and it is the same way with the other church. We inter-marry there, and the pastors of the brides advise them to go with their husbands. Both Churches are the same way in that regard. There is not much need of unification as far as our two Churches are concerned at Johnson City. I want to come up to this question of unification. When the question of organic union came up, I went into the papers against it. Sometimes I write a little—not often, but I do my best when I get at it; and I fought as hard as I could against organic union all through the years. The clouds grew larger as we met at Asheville, and I thundered the hardest I could when they started the question of unification, but it did no good. I thought the young preachers of our Church were too zealous in the fight, and I thought it was a mistaken zeal. I fought the movement the best I could, but it ran over me and over every one who thought as I did. We came on down four years later to the Oklahoma Conference, and there they just put the thing through; but it didn't suit me one bit, and I came out against it after my Church had so spoken. I did my best to show that it was illogical and was a mistake, and that you never could pick up two million Southern Methodists, even if you could four million Northern ones, and put them into one organization; that such a thing never had been done, and I did not believe it ever could be done. I never was more surprised in all my life when I was put on this Commission. I tried to be frank with the Church which had honored me. I conferred with my pastor; I conferred with others as to what I should do. Well, they said in substance,

"If you can surrender your judgment to that of the General Conference as to the feasibility of this thing, you can consistently accept the position to which you have been appointed, and go on that Commission." I thought over it and I prayed over it, and I did what I didn't like to do—I surrendered my judgment. So I have learned how to surrender my judgment, but I have not yet learned how to surrender a principle. Both General Conferences have indorsed what I do not believe in. I do not believe in these Regional Conferences, but I am bound by my General Conference. I am not going to do anything against the Regional Conference plan, if you get up the right kind. I do not believe that feature can be successfully worked. I think it is going to breed trouble. I think it is cutting away the rights of the episcopacy, as now projected, and will promote sectionalism. I could give other reasons, but I will simply content myself with saying that my judgment does not accord with it, and I am not for it as now outlined, nor, in fact, in any shape. Now, what are we going to do about the negro? That question looms up. As far as the negro is concerned, I want you to know that my mother's father was the largest slaveholder in Washington County. He was a Pennyslvanian—came from York County, Pa.; and was, as stated, the largest slaveholder in Washington County, which once embraced all the territory now in the State of Tennessee, and is the mother and grandmother of ninety-five counties. I live in that county, and it was the first county ever named for George Washington in the United States: that is history. The burning question is, What are we gonig to do about the negro? I was brought up with him, and played with him through my boyhood. My father would whip me and the negro boys impartially, when we had done some mischievous thing that did not suit him. It made no difference to him that I was his white boy and that the others were his negro slaves. I was brought up with them; and I was brought up to believe that if I would not defend a negro who had no chance for defense from insult, I was a poltroon. He found in me what was not in the law. That was the way with most of the slaveholders. You need not think the masters were brutes. They stood ready to protect their negroes. They knew when to do it. Not only their financial interests were compelling, but they responded to every demand that the defenseless negroes had on them. They did everything that honor and justice demanded. So, Dr. Jones, when you said that you believed you would fall in love with me before sunset, you put it two hours too late, for I might die before I got that benediction. I want Dr. Jones to know, and I want him to believe it, that I have no feeling but a good feeling for the negro. Dr. Du Bose, as a member of our General Conference, told me what to do. Dr. Du Bose said:

"You put the negro into a separate organization." Now he says that does not mean "Church." What did it mean, Doctor? What does it mean if it does not mean a separate Church?

H. M. Du Bose: I told you what it meant.

E. C. Reeves: And you deftly inverted and perverted the obvious meaning of the wording in your speech this morning. I was instructed by my General Conference, and I am here to represent the General Conference, on this question of unification; and I will stand for everything within the four corners of the Oklahoma platform, in letter and in spirit, but I can go no further on the negro question. Dr. Du Bose told me it was to be a separate Church; and half a dozen others are here now, members of this Commission, who told me, as members of the General Conference, the same thing, and I took that instruction, and I was governed by it. I had never heard that a "separate Church organization" did not mean a separate Church; and if it had been frankly stated to the General Conference that it did not mean that, but that you might construe it into having a meaning so as to embrace the negro in the unified Church, you could no more have passed that paper before the General Conference than you could untwist the beams of light that come from the sun in heaven; and if that is not what you meant, you should have been frank with the General Conference. I took what you said as an instruction from you. That accords with my idea, and the masses are going to have it that way or not at all. I want that kind of a Church. I want the negroes in a separate Church, there to be as independent as I am in my Church. Now I am going to take up what several of the members of this Commission have said, and I am going to take up Dr. Goucher first. Dr. Goucher is the Chesterfield of this Commission, a Christian at heart, as I verily believe, and a prince among men. I say that with all candor. The Doctor says that in the new constitution there must be no legislation in favor of any class on account of color or previous condition of servitude or anything else. Very well, Doctor. You have said so. I agree with you, and I go on further and say, what others have said. To illustrate: Dr. Downey emphasizes, with lung power at least, "No discriminations on account of color." All right. Then comes Dr. Randall, who thinks that whatever concessions are made must be offered not as a charity, but of right. All right, Doctor. Then I come down to my friend, Dr. Jones, who fell in love with me by the time the sun went down. Dr. Jones, in his unique address, which so deeply moved me—it did—put me in full sympathy with him. He made his last strenuous appeal in these words: "I want a man's chance." God bless you, Dr. Jones, I want you to have a man's chance; I do. But you will

get it only in a separate Church. Brother Simpson had a vision, and saw just what he was looking for. The matter before us is much more real than a dream. He said that a negro has equality before the law, and why not ecclesiastically? So say we all, but differ as to the where. Then Brother Pollock—Sir Knight Pollock—got so enthusiastic in favor of the poor darky—well, he was so overcome with feeling that he almost reached the conclusion that because we didn't see just as he did, in conferring rights on the negro, that we hardly believed he had a soul; at least he asked the question, "Has he not got a soul?" I will tell you how I answered that question more than fifty years ago, while attending a law college. I saw a fellow who had a book he had written, called "Ariel," and he was haranguing the crowd on the street, and I found out that he was discussing the merits of that book and said that he had proved conclusively in it that the negro had no soul. When he got through, he asked me if he couldn't sell me a book; and I said no, that I was afraid if I bought the book and was caught with it, the fool-killer might get me. Now, I am not jesting about those things; you need not be laughing. I am in dead earnest. This is a serious matter on our hands. Bishop McDowell made a powerful and compact speech to prove that there is a vast difference between withholding and granting of rights. Well, that is good logic. Bishop McDowell made a good speech. I might have made most of that speech myself, for I agree with nearly everything he said. Every quotation he made I indorse. But, Bishop, from Dr. Goucher to yourself inclusive, you all have the right motive power; you have hitched it, however, to the wrong car. That is what is the matter. Attach it to the Oklahoma platform and we will unify. I want the negro in a Church where he can exercise all his rights and privileges that he has never had heretofore. I know I was criticized in an article in one of your leading papers because I argued for a separate Church. I was told, inferentially, that because I was not willing for the negro to become a part of the unified Church I did not belong to the Church of God. I know the views that some of the brethren of the North entertain about these things. But let us talk a little about them. First, I want to say something about Bishop Hamilton's views. He is logical in that there cannot be two classes of members in the same Church, and that you cannot afford to go into any Church organization that cuts privileges on account of color. I will never vote for any such thing, because it is contrary to my judgment; and whenever you undertake to limit the rights or privileges of the negro, you become illogical, and you get into trouble, as is shown on this floor, for it takes half of your time to explain the whys and wherefores. It is a very simple

matter if the negro's rights and privileges are conceded in full. But take, not simply that first proposition that is laid down, but the second proposition. What does it all mean? It may mean this and it may mean that. It is not a frank statement as to the rights of the negro, and I defy all mankind who may read it—every intelligent human being on the earth—with the light of the facts before him, to prove to any reasonable mind that it is a frank statement. If you don't want the negro to have equal rights in the unified Church, say so. If you do, say so, and let him know just what is expected of him, and don't have him hung up in the air. You have hitched him to the wrong car—to that of Church amalgamation, instead of to an independent Church organization. Remember that at the time of the transfiguration it was stated: "We are going to build three tabernacles; one for Thee, one for Moses, and one for Elias." It was all very well for them to make a tabernacle for the Master, but they further put Moses and Elias into separate tabernacles. Now we want to make two tabernacles, and the one is to confer the same rights and privileges that the other does. And there will be Christian relations between the two. I am logical, whether I am right or wrong in the application of it. You get into confusion whenever you undertake to cut away the negro's rights and privileges; whenever you undertake to hide them under words and leave the future to develop them, and tell us what they mean, you get into trouble every time you do it. As I was going to say, what do we offer? A Church in which we can help the negro, just as we have been trying to help our Colored Methodist Episcopal Church in the South. We can have our fraternal relations with him. Has he ever had full rights in your Church? Whenever you don't allow him to mix in the affairs of the Church freely, whenever you draw the color line, there is an abridgment of rights as surely as you are born. No, they have never had those rights, and every time that line is drawn there, whether you want to do it or whether it is forced upon you, all the same it is an acknowledgment of that racial distinction which, I believe, Nature herself has pointed out. The negro has never had his full rights in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and that is one reason why I want him to be organized into an independent Church where he will have his full rights; and you, Dr. Jones and Dr. Penn, should go forth as the leaders of a great movement; and you have an opportunity presented to you such as has never been presented to any other colored men in all our country's history, to lead all the colored Methodists in our land into one great, independent Church where they can control their Church organization and develop race consciousness, and settle once for all the negro problem. Fraternal re-

lations between the two great Churches would naturally follow, and strife would cease. My colleague, Dr. Blackwell, in his speech seemed to talk very feelingly about his failure, and that of his Church, in the discharge of duty to the negro. I, being dull of hearing, was uncertain whether he was choked with emotion or was simply treading a soft pedal for effect. The latter is permissible, for a speaker has the undoubted right to modulate his voice for effect, as I am now doing. He reflected severely on himself, and almost acknowledged that he had committed the unpardonable sin for not having done more for the negro in the past. Certainly the opportunity was not lacking. But, Doctor, when you go into a unified Church with 311,000 negroes who have been helped for fifty years as no other body of people ever has, and exclude all other Methodist negroes (for they, being independent, will never surrender that independency in order to become a minority body and be governed by the whites), how will that widen your individual opportunity to help the more needy negroes? Or, how will it better the condition of the Colored Methodist Church to be severed from those who have been their benefactors for fifty years? I do not comprehend the learned Doctor's position, therefore cannot see the force of his reasoning. His argument seems to lead to a plan to help more largely than heretofore that class of negroes who have been helped to millions upon millions, through the fifty years past, and cut off from assistance those who have been meagerly helped by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, for the last half century. If the Doctor is logical, his logic is hidden from my view. While the question, as stated, is the status of the negro, the real question is, to devise a feasible plan for unification. The negro status is an incidental question, though the most difficult problem to solve. Among the twenty-five speakers who have been heard, Bishop Murrah, Judge White, and Dr. Lamar, if I remember correctly, are the only ones who have pointed out the difficulties in the way of getting our Southern people voluntarily to go into a Church embracing the negroes, thus running counter to the customs and laws of our Southland which enter into the warp and woof of our Southern society. What are we going to do with the two millions of white Methodists who necessarily must, or an overwhelming majority of them, go into the unified Church, or leave unification a signal failure? Can a plan be devised acceptable to them with the negro included? That is the question of questions. Whatever we may plan, the masses of both Churches will have the final say. Church membership is voluntary. I confess that I see no way by which the large majority of my Church can be moved into a mixed Church. We got away from that question fifty years ago, and you are asking us to reverse

ourselves, go back to it to be vexed again, we and our children after us. I might consider the proposition of our Church to enter again into such an entanglement if what was done a half century ago, in setting up the negroes who adhered to us into an independent Church, had not proved a success. We settled the problem then, and wisely too; and, Dr. Penn, when you were making the comparison in numbers of those who belong to the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, and those who belong to the Methodist Episcopal Church, you ignored the fact that millions of dollars had been poured out to secure your 311,000 negro members; and had those millions been given by our Church to assist the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, while practically, possibly, you might have as many negro members in your Church as reported now, certainly you would not lead by a few thousands in numbers the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church now. The negro is like the white man in that he loves to be around where money is, and for the laudable purpose of having his children educated, and for having church buildings erected. The Colored Methodist Episcopal Church has been a marvel of success considering the meager help received from the Southern Methodist Church—a Church much limited in its means when compared with its rich sister Church. Now, brothers, getting away from that, I return to the fact that we must devise a practical unification plan if we can. We claim that the Oklahoma plan is the logical one. I believe, and free from all doubt, that the index finger of Nature points out the only plan, the one that is based on racial distinctions. The immutable law runs through the whole animal kingdom, man included. Why, away back yonder in the days of Ahab, Baalim had an animal. Unmixed with other kinds, it has come down to us the unchanged donkey. In the days of William the Conqueror, the Arabian courser was the same that he is to-day. Why? Because, according to the laws of nature, the breed was kept pure by being uncrossed with other kinds of animals. Mix the two and you get a product, and what is it? One that has neither pride of ancestry nor hope of posterity, and never had any self-respect, and never had any—what's the word?

Frank Neff: Racial consciousness!

E. C. Reeves: Yes, never had enough race consciousness to put a bow in his neck. Go back to the days of the Hittites, the Hivites, the Jebusites, the Canaanites, and the Israelites and learn how tribal and national entities were maintained. Under the theocracy under which they lived the Israelites were inhibited from mixing with other races. And what was the result? The Jews were transported to Babylon, but while captives, and after their return, and through the ages to the present time, the

Jew is the same, with the same propensity to drive a bargain and steal a march in business as moved his old father Jacob as he sat on the bank of the stream where the kine came for water, peeling saplings to induce spotted calves that he might beat his father-in-law in a division of the cattle. But the remnant of the Jews who went not into captivity, but remained and mixed with the Cushi, made the Samaritans, who are lost to history except one good Samaritan who lives in Biblical story because of one good, unselfish deed. That line of demarcation is recognized and acted upon by all nations, both civilized and uncivilized, in Church and State, and in commercial life everywhere. True, Dr. Penn told us how the black man was pouring out his blood in defense of our country, and that side by side with the white man, but neglected to state that the white and black soldiers are grouped into different regiments. We all know that. Why are they thus segregated? It is but the index finger of Nature pointing out the road. And we are asked to create a Church on a theory that antagonizes a principle that has ruled supreme throughout the world for more than forty centuries. Right here, and in further proof that I have no prejudice against the negro, I state: That while I am a Democrat to the marrow bone, and admire President Wilson, I did openly condemn his course in not having the murder of the negro soldiers in Mexico avenged. I would have meted out punishment to those murderers at the risk of involving our whole country in war. Let us again face our question squarely. I want a separate Church for the negroes, believing that to be the only solution. You do not, but insist on a plan that includes the negro with a limitation placed upon his rights and privileges; a plan illogical upon its face and inimical to Southern life. We are in the midst of a dilemma. What can we do? I confess I do not know. I do not believe anything short of separate Churches will be acceptable to a majority of those I represent. Of course it would be unfortunate if any agreement reached by this Joint Commission should be rejected by the General or Annual Conferences of either Church. I would that an agreement could be reached that would commend itself to, at least, an overwhelming majority of the membership of both Churches. One thing more and I will quit. The Jim Crow laws would be repugnant to the unified Church you seek to establish. You ought to know that those laws were not enacted by the several Southern States on account of prejudice against the negro, but for his protection as much as for anything else. I will give you some facts from which you may draw proper conclusions. A negro, named McElwee, happened to be elected to the legislature of Tennessee. On his way to the State capital he was riding in a coach with the whites, and his seat was on the sunny side

of the coach. A small sick man occupied a seat on the opposite side of the car. He left his seat for a drink of water, leaving nothing in his seat. McElwee left his seat and took the one vacated by the sick man, who returned and asked the negro to vacate, but he abruptly declined. A burly white passenger, with a large hickory cane, struck the negro across his head and tumbled him into the aisle, compelled him to resume his former seat, and placed the sick man in his seat. I saw a laboring negro, filthy in person, seat himself beside a lady dressed in silk in a street car in Nashville, Tenn., and the lady immediately vacated her seat. On the other hand, frequently drunken, ruffian white men would abuse inoffensive negroes in railroad coaches. The conditions in travel were often almost intolerable before the passage of the Jim Crow laws. Now, the negroes travel unmolested, and the white ladies are no more forced to sit beside the negroes or vacate for them. A white passenger is no more allowed to ride in a negro coach than the latter is permitted to enter the car of white passengers. As I was coming to Savannah, on leaving Spartanburg, I entered a vacant coach for a smoke, but the conductor informed me that I was in the negro coach; and though there was not a negro in it, I had to leave the car. Those laws are rigidly enforced, have proved to be most wholesome, are a greater protection to the negro than to the whites, and are a blessing to society generally. It is unfortunate that the negroes are unable to maintain a sleeping-car system on account of their lack of numbers who travel and a lack of means. That is their misfortune, but not the fault of the law. We have been told oftentimes how we will grow as a Church after unification. I do not believe there will be rapid growth in the South, if any at all, in a mixed Church. You think you cannot give up the negro; in fact, you positively refuse to do so. Well, we think we know that our people will not accept him in Church relations. There has been an almost irresistible force for unification, but it is now pounding against an immovable obstruction—the negro problem. I believe I am instructed by my Church in the premise, and on those instructions I stand to-day, immovable, but with all the good feeling for the negro, and for every member of this body, that one human being can have for another. I stand in my integrity and solemnly declare that I do not want to do anything that will hurt the cause of religion and good morals, and the uplift, not only of the white people but the negro race. Let us get together if we can in good conscience. If we cannot, there is one thing I shall be thankful for. I shall be thankful that I have met you brethren and learned more about you than I knew of you before; and if unification

-

does come, I shall take all the Methodist Episcopal bishops into my arms, and they will be as much my bishops as yours, even down to my friend there (Bishop Cooke), and we were pretty far apart; but I can get close enough to him to feel his heart throbs, and I hope he has the same kind of feeling for me.

Bishop Cooke: Amen!

E. C. Reeves: And it will not all be in vain. We know more about each other, and respect each other the more. We love each other; and we will go forth and tell our peoples what Christian fellowship we have had here, and it will certainly have a great and grand influence on the future over the membership of both Churches.

Bishop McDowell: A privileged motion. I move that when we adjourn this afternoon we adjourn to meet this evening at 8:30, with the understanding that we shall not remain in session beyond 10 o'clock. I think we can talk an hour and a half this evening, provided we put ourselves under bond as to the time limit for the end of the meeting.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Claudius B. Spencer: I have watched the days of these debates with something more than interest. I come from a border State, like Mr. Brown and Dr. Neff. I come from a region which not only desires unification but is demanding it. One of the most intellectual men in our town told me the day before I left for Savannah that in case we did not succeed in finding some basic principle on which we could construct an acceptable policy he would favor calling immediately an independent organization or convention to take in hand this matter of unification. I know of States where the two Methodisms are side by side, but without enmity, and are holding back the building of churches because they are waiting to hear what is done in this meeting. I know of a large educational enterprise hung up in mid-air for the same reason. Brothers, those who live in States where neither is bent and weak, but where both are strong and rich and powerful as things go, they are the ones that are determined that this movement shall not come to nothing. For that reason I have observed the debates of these days not without a desire amounting to a passion that God would manifest himself and that he would bring us to some well-defined outline. Mr. Chairman, there is one phase of this question as to the Status of the Negro which has thus far had very scant treatment. It is: What will be our message in mission lands if we draw a color line here at home? Are we considering that? Mr. Chairman, united Methodism will be a world Church. Already the Methodist Episcopal Church, in such a sense as is

true of no other denomination on this planet unless it be the Roman Catholic Church, is a world Church. Our Saviour gave us our orders, "Go into all the world, to every creature." John Wesley responded to that challenge: "The world is my parish." Methodism has been God's restless pathfinder, God's ambassador speaking out what she has received, hurrying to make Wesley's proclamation good. Wesley and Whitefield here in Savannah, Coke sleeping his long sleep on the floor of the Indian Ocean, Kingsley in Syria, Wiley in China, Ward dying in Japan, Melville Cox (from South Carolina) dead in Africa, are but signs of our world empire. The northernmost city of this planet, Hamerfest, within the Arctic Circle, and Punta Arenas, on the straits of Magellan, the southernmost town, each has a Methodist congregation, with a regularly appointed Methodist pastor; and between them where flies a flag where our missionaries are not abroad and at work? Therefore, whether we will or no, this Joint Commission must and will give a world testimony. We cannot plan for ourselves alone, here in the United States, with no regard to the outside lands or to the bearing of what we do here will be in its world testimony. We here in this Joint Commission are speaking aloud wherever a missionary is at work. And we dare not speak in a double voice. Mr. Chairman, we cannot lay too much stress on this aspect of our discussion of race and color when we are providing the structure of a new Methodism. Already among the many scores of missionary societies organized in this country, in Great Britain, France, Denmark, Switzerland, Scandinavia, South Africa, and Australia, we are far and away in the van. Bishop McDowell said yesterday that in some near-by day we might have a million members in India alone. To carry out to the full the promise of Wesley, the Methodist Episcopal Church is now in a campaign for forty million dollars for the purpose of financing solely its world missionary enterprise. Now, what does all this imply? It means two things. We are a world Church (and we will be even more so under unification), and we must have a world message to bear a world testimony. We dare not speak on race questions with a double voice, one voice abroad and another here among ourselves in the United States. How then does it stand? We go to the millions of India with a message which they have never heard before, the message from a God of love; that he is a Christ-like God, a God who is a Father of all men and to all men, with its corollary that all men are Christ's brothers and brothers of each other; that their Magna Charta is the brotherhood of the Sermon on the Mount. Our message is the Brotherhood of Man. But what is our message worth if our message and

our testimony do not agree? Mr. Chairman, this is a fateful day. We are not living at this moment to ourselves, to North or South, to expediency and convenience and opportunism alone. We cannot do that if we will. Our missionary enterprise in all lands is listening in suspense as to what we shall do to-day as to races and colors. We are speaking to the planet as well as to each other. What shall we *over there* say of human brotherhood if we also must confess that *over here*, here at the home base and fountain head, we withdraw from a brother Christian, because of his color, a brother's hand; if we draw the color line, the line of race exclusion? Will not the Brahmin say, "Physician, heal thyself"? Mr. Chairman, I have referred to India. India is a land without a soul. The cobra fang of caste has struck the soul of India dead. And why? Because caste—rigid race separation, rigid race exclusion—is supreme. Caste is as yet untouched. It stands a great wall high as Babel right through Indian life, so that missionaries are helpless except, in the main, to those beyond and below all caste, to the outcaste. Bishop McDowell came back from India and reported that the missionaries have scarcely touched the shadow of the hem of the garment* of India. And why? Because of that impenetrable bastille of caste. Caste must fall before Christianity can ever be more than a surface and almost a negligible endeavor. God must strike it down. We all know that. Mr. Chairman, wherein lurks the poison of caste? It is the curse of color. Caste is a word derived from the word "color," and there in Hindustan it was applied first of all to the negro stock. Caste in India is a negro question. We have a message to India, to its incurable, impenetrable paralysis and despair. What is that message? It is the condemnation of caste. It is the message of human brotherhood, of concrete, visible fraternity. It is a word from the Christlike God. Our very first word—I am speaking of India, not of the United States of America—is the denunciation and striking down of the color line as it is there perfected with such inhumanity. And, Mr. Chairman, there is an important question: What is the mainstay of the power of caste in Indian life? I beg you to notice: It lies in this, that caste in India has the sanction of religion. Religion, the religion of India, provides and indorses the color line. God forbid that any similar cobra of a color line should in this day, when men are wading through hell in Europe in hopes of bringing back a better day of brotherhood and solidarity—God forbid that here in this country of America a color line should have the sanction of religion, the sanction of the reorganized Methodist Church. I remember reading of one of the churches in Southern India where they have a wall of considerable height

running through the auditorium, splitting it, separating the castes. What sort of a witness—I care not for their methods—but what sort of a witness is that? I say it is a painted corpse. “Faith without works is dead.” Bishop Bashford wrote me a letter only a few days ago in which he set forth: “I will say in a word that I greatly desire union.” We all know that, we know what he did at Saratoga Springs. “I will say in a word that I greatly desire union. On the other hand, I am absolutely clear that our Church cannot afford, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, cannot afford, to have a union on any basis which theoretically or practically excludes the colored races from our organization.” We simply dare not send Bishop Bashford back to China with a lesser message than he had before, to say to his coworkers that the Church at home has drawn the color line. It seems to me we dare not send to our workers in India the message that hereafter Methodism—not in India, but right here in America—is a respecter of the color of a man’s face, that we really do not want to admit a colored man into our councils. Do we dare to speak there or anywhere with a double voice, speaking one word with our lips and another here with our hand? Mr. Chairman, I have a passion. It is that the stream which divided us in 1844 should here in Savannah, where John Wesley first stood upon this continent, find here the end of her divisions and again flow together. I come from a border State in which, far beyond any other State in the union, the two branches of the one family are nearly equally divided, but none the less divided against each other. They rebel at it. They demand an end of it and they mean what they say. You have heard from Mr. Brown and from the telegrams from Kansas and St. Louis how determined is the longing of these members of the family to sit together again as the one family they feel and know themselves to be, around the one table of the Lord, and kneel around the one and forever indivisible family altar to speak there to God, and side by side catch that Voice which says, “I have called you friends.” To bring in this condition in these border States represented by those telegrams as shown by Mr. Brown, to bring in this desire for unity, to prepare the way for the coming reunion, I have labored, as I might be able as editor, day and night for years, and I shall turn homeward with a sinking heart, depressed by our inapt misunderstandings of the will of God, if here, where John Wesley stood, we cannot see eye to eye, and build together the basic principles of a polity which shall be a mighty testimony to mankind, that mankind is one, for Methodism is one. Let us not chop it up. Let us not build walls of color separation. Brotherhood, inter-racial brotherhood, that is what they need in India;

let us not nullify it here at home. According to what Dr. Jones has said here, that is what our colored brethren need to-day more than any other one thing. I believe that. We need to make our testimony to inter-racial brotherhood, visibly and concretely imbedded in our organic law, guaranteeing humanity all its rights, that we can take our testimony to Southern Asia without shame on our face. Brotherhood, that is the first principle. Mr. Chairman, it is not a minor principle. With it is the second principle; this racial opportunity and responsibility which we call race consciousness, developed along with brotherhood, not outside of it. Those are the two points, brothers, in America and in India; brotherhood first, race consciousness later. Now, will you permit me to add a word? I have tried to weigh the remarks, indeed the sharp criticisms, as to our Church which have come from our brothers from the South; and I have felt a little like indulging myself in turn in a single observation. I was once going to Tuskegee and the train was drawing in and I didn't know whether Mr. Washington would meet me at the station or not (he did, I may say). I ventured to ask a young lady opposite me in the train if she would kindly point the way to the institution, which she did and then said: "We like him down here in Tuskegee. He knows his place; he always comes to our back door." Now, I think there is a considerable philosophy in that. You have spoken freely about our condition. I am not offended; but I for my part have thought, as I have passed through the South a good many times and talked with the leaders of the Church, South, the leaders also of other Churches, that the knowledge of the South very largely was the knowledge of the negro through that back door, the negro that serves, the negro that works, that takes care of the cotton plantation, that handles the oil presses, the hewer of wood and the drawer of water. I was told in Atlanta on the way down here that when they had that great colored chorus at the Billy Sunday meetings how it was a revelation to the people right in Atlanta as to the capacity and advancement of the negro. One of the chief men—I am sure you would say—of the South was in my office a few days ago, passing through our city, and he honored me with a visit. We got to talking the matter over with absolute frankness. He knows me and I know him. "Well," he said, "Doctor, we in the South must put our hands still more on the negro." "But," I said, "my dear friend, that is not far enough. You have been doing that more or less, and I give you credit for all that has been done. But we have to get farther than that. We have not only to put our hands on him, but our hands *in his*; and when that is done in downright sincerity a new day will dawn." I have been down to your Paine College in Augusta, Ga. I knew there George Williams Walker, your

hero; and if he would give men any credentials you would not need any more. I am glad of what has been accomplished there; and yet as I know well its story in these later years, as I have read the recent bitter appeals for it of John Wesley Gilbert, whom I also know, a noble type of man, one of the best types of the negro race, I have felt as if there was not very much there at Paine to boast of. I am sure you agree. Brothers, I have tried to understand this Southern question from the standpoint of Southern sentiment; for, after all, that is the great side. I have stood with uncovered head at the grave of the great Calhoun. I have walked in Hollywood at Richmond, Va., and stood by that historic grave there. I have felt my eyes grow moist as I have stood in the little villages here in the Southland and have seen how the sewing circles in these little villages have worked and toiled to get together enough money to build some simple shaft in the public square to their soldier dead, who wore the gray in the War between the States. Nowhere else in all this land have I felt a thrill much deeper than before spectacles like that. Thank God we are one nation, with no star absent from the flag. I will not weary you with reminiscences. They mean nothing except I hope they produce the impression upon you that in these things I have said as to the absolute supremacy of the principle of brotherhood in the reorganized Church, and contempt for race exclusiveness, I have not been animated by any thoughtless Pharisaism. Mr. Chairman, as I look abroad upon the broken lands and the broken peoples wading into the shambles of Europe to-day, I see that the great need of all the races, wherever you find them, in any hemisphere, is first of all the brother's hand—the gospel that in reality and visibly and concretely enshrines Christian brotherhood. Let us not in this hour nullify our profession. Let us not stigmatize our professions in this matter. Let us not put anybody out, nor expect anybody to go out. We want in the Methodist Church every race for whom Christ died; and I want them to stay. Now is the time for us to make a new adventure. Let us tear down barriers and not build any more. God grant that we be big enough to put the heresy of race under our feet. God grant that in this age of hope for the human race, in the battles and convulsions and birth throes of a better civilization, we may be in the van, not in the rear. It is our Judgment Day. Surely, we can be Christian democrats. Then the message of the Methodist Church to the races of the outside and of our own world will not be spoken with a muffled and double voice.

“Praise God, from whom all blessings flow” was sung, Dr. Blake pronounced the benediction, and the session then adjourned.

NIGHT SESSION.

The session was called to order by Bishop McDowell.

Devotional exercises were conducted by Dr. Young.

The hymn, "Children of the Heavenly King," was sung.

Dr. Young read John xv.

The hymn, "How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord," was sung.

Prayer was offered by Dr. Young.

The roll was called, and the following were present: Bishops Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. B. Murrah, James Atkins, Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Ministers: F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, C. M. Bishop, J. M. Moore, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar, Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. W. Van Cleve, J. J. Wallace, C. M. Stuart (reserve). Laymen: M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White, G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, H. W. Rogers, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock.

The journal of the afternoon session was read and approved.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: As I listened to some of the brethren who have spoken upon this subject give a little of their pedigree as a reason for the position they occupy, I felt myself a little in the position of a gentleman who was undergoing the torture of having his census taken. When the census taker asked, "What is your nationality?" he said: "Sure, that is what I would like to know. My father was an Englishman, my mother was an Irish woman, I was born on a Dutch ship under the French flag in Turkish waters." My father was a Dutchman from New Jersey; my mother was of Scotch-Irish extraction, and her grandfather came to Illinois from Southwest Virginia by way of Kentucky. I was brought up in Southern Illinois, a border strip largely settled from Kentucky, Tennessee, and North Carolina. I married the daughter of a Tennessean family, and I just wondered which side of this discussion I ought naturally to take. There have been some restraints that have held me back on this debate; the character of the debate itself, somewhat. I have had the privilege of sitting in several of our General Conferences and hearing the debate upon some of the greatest, most earnestly discussed questions that ever came before us. I do not believe I have ever heard a more remarkable debate than we have had in this meeting. Furthermore, every time I have thought of taking part in it I have been impressed that this was about the most

important thing that I ever approached, and every time I moved forward I immediately drew back because, say what you will, the truth of the expression that this is the crux of the whole negotiation becomes more evident as we go on. I think we all believe thoroughly and profoundly that the whole question of the unification of Methodism is hanging upon the action that will be finally taken relative to this question. If we can go forward here, we can go forward to the end without obstruction; if we are halted here, we are halted, for we cannot tell how long or how hopelessly. There is a feeling of responsibility when we think about getting into this debate. Besides that, there are issues that are collateral to the debate itself. This is not merely a question of the unification of Methodism. It touches questions that reach outside of Methodism, and whatever decision the Methodist Church may reach concerning this cannot fail to affect all these questions in all their ramifications. I do not think we can consider this question with all these matters left out. It is unfortunate, as I think every one of us will concede, that in the discussions of this Commission a single race should be in a sense set apart for this kind of special consideration. There is none of us who does not realize the extreme difficulty of the position in which the members of that race are placed in this discussion. If there is such a one, there is certainly something lacking in his imagination. I have been moved again and again with a feeling of deep sympathy for the two brethren on this Commission about whom and whose people this debate has centered itself, and yet it was unavoidable. Every proposition specially singles this race out, beginning from Chattanooga and coming on down through the other meetings. It really appears to be made necessary by the historical situation. I do not think it is worth my while to go back into a catalogue of anybody's transgressions in the course of the development of the situation we have now reached. If I were going to confess anybody's sins, I think I should take the liberty only of confessing my own and those of my section, because I have a kind of feeling that I cannot sympathetically confess the sins of any other man. I do not enter well enough into this situation. It is vastly more agreeable to confess another man's sins. I am not so sure about its being easier; but I have the conviction that if we were to take the sins that each of these sections has charged directly or indirectly against the other, or if, upon the other hand, we take the sins which they separately and severally have confessed, we should have a catalogue quite long enough to satisfy anybody, and I would not be at all surprised if all of them were true. The situation, because of this history, without going into it at all, is not an easy and natural situation. We are impressed more than a little by the fact that there are sensitive spots that we are con-

tinually coming up against. Nobody feels quite easy. If we could for just one hour sit down and divest ourselves of every lingering trace of suspicion that comes out of prejudices engendered in our mind by what comes to us from the past, if we could get rid of every trace of the sensitiveness engendered by suspicion, we could come to an agreement in that hour. Now, as to the reach of this matter that we are handling at the present time. This question of the Status of the Negro in the Church is very closely allied with a question to which it is subsidiary, the question of finding a place for the negro in our civilization. We cannot separate them. You may say we have nothing to do with that, but we do have almost everything to do with it. There is no man who has read the history of the Church and the nation who does not feel that the fact that this Church, in the intensity of its convictions in 1844, found it necessary to separate into two bodies, tremendously drove on the nation to separation and to the terrible storm of civil war. It seems just as certain that if we can find a satisfactory basis, a Christian basis that will appeal to the conscience and intelligence of the best men of the country, if we can agree upon a real place and a final satisfactory place for the negro in the reorganized Church, we will tremendously help this nation to find a place for the negro in its civilization. That place has not yet been found. I have heard brethren speak very confidently as if the place for the negro in the civilization and especially in the Southern civilization were finally fixed, but I have not the least hesitation in saying that that place has not been found. Whenever we find the place for the negro in our civilization there will be an end to unrest and discontent and friction such as we have now. They exist because we have not found the negro's place. As a matter of fact, I think most men who look at it seriously realize that we have not. Very few people of either race are satisfied with the present situation in this country with regard to the position of the negro. No matter what he thinks the negro's place ought to be, he is sure the matter has not been settled. The negro is not satisfied. Eight hundred thousand people would not pull out of one part of the country and look for better conditions elsewhere if they were satisfied. This is an unsettled question. One of the most absolutely true remarks at any point of the handling of this question was that remark of Judge White that this is not a question of the individual but of the mass. We do not approach a solution, nor do we indicate that we have approached a solution, when we talk about the personal relations that have existed or that now exist between individuals of the white race and individuals of the colored race. In the situation we confront now that is absolutely irrelevant. All this talk, which is perfectly fine and perfectly true and which has presented so many things that were

beautiful about the relations of Southern men with their old mammies, does not touch this question anywhere, even on the rim. It is the mass relations of the two elements in our civilization that have to be considered and somehow adjusted, and that in its relation to the Church is precisely the thing that we have to adjust within the Church, and it is my conviction that until we have reached a solution on that subject there is going to be no rest for either white or black. This question is more important to the South than to anybody else in the United States, geographically and personally, because you of the South are in such immediate contact with it; and I might say with equal force that the South is more important to this question than anybody else in the United States for the very same reason. The South is in the process of beginning the building of an industrial civilization, a process which is to go on in this country to a very great development. The leading men of every community in the South are going to put their minds on this problem, for with the development of manufacturing, the building of great cities, and the gathering together of great industries and business enterprises this problem will rise all over the South, much more than with us in the North, for here the agricultural and the industrial problem alike will be the problem of labor. I do not think that you can build a great industrial civilization in the South unless somehow you shall develop for yourselves a body of labor that is intelligent, independent, and progressive. You cannot have a progressive civilization that is not founded upon the progressiveness of its laborers. That is just as sure as anything can be, and somehow or other that is the problem which the South must work out for itself. If your labor is ignorant, if it is provincial, if it is backward, if it is undeveloped, your country, your civilization, your cities, and your industries will partake of the same character. So I say you cannot afford to build up that kind of a body of laborers here in your own Southland. That is one part of your problem. The other is this, that until this unrest that exists among the negro people of the South, until this degree of friction and misunderstanding and lack of confidence between the negroes and the whites of the South shall disappear, I think you will agree with me in saying that you will never have as quiet a heart as you would like to have about your situation. You are all more or less afraid of what may break loose. It is vital to your civilization that that situation shall be changed. As long as there are mistrust and resentment smoldering in the hearts of these people, more dangerous because not spoken, you have a situation that will not be conducive to restfulness of mind on the part of anybody. If this situation is to be changed, if you are to get a body of laborers who are going to be intelligent and independent and progressive

and in a measure trustful of those with whom they are associated, receiving and giving confidence, the production of that new situation is going to require the combined coöperation of the leadership of the South. Now, I have appreciated very greatly, as every member of the Commission to which I belong has appreciated, the references made by our brethren of the South as to what we have been able to do for the elevation of the negro. We believe we have been able to do something and that it was worth while, but I have a conviction in my mind that the Methodist Episcopal Church alone, working very largely from the other side of the Ohio River at long distance and with a lack of immediate contact, will never be able to do anything but patchwork on this question. That is a misfortune of our situation. We are glad to do what we can, and we want to help just as long and as far forward as we can, but the real solution of this problem rests with the people of the South—not alone the white people of the South. I do not believe that the white people of the South can settle this thing for the negro. I believe they can settle it with the negro. But never until the leading minds of the two races shall come to mutual understanding and coöperation for the solution of this problem will it be really approaching the solution which every American heart and every Christian heart most earnestly desires. I believe that the solution is going to come. I would not undertake to say what it will be, because prophecy is not an exact science. I am not at all sure that I even approximately know what it ought to be, but there are evidences of the dawn of a new dispensation for the negro in the South. Once in a while I have heard things said and sometimes facts have come to my knowledge that have revealed conditions relative to this problem, which have almost made me say in my heart, "This is the darkest hour for the negro that ever dawned"; and then I come upon facts which make me say, "The darkest hour is just before the dawn," and there are really evidences of the dawn. I have seen some things in some papers in this part of the country, and I have heard some things from some of the brethren here, that would indicate that this exodus of the negro from the South is a kind of negligible fact to which we need pay very little attention. But whether or not we need to give it little attention, it has received a great deal of attention. It has been almost like an alarm bell in certain sections and communities in the South. I heard from Bishop Thirkield, I heard from one after another of the leading ministers among our negro members of the Church, that they have been approached by white men begging them to use their influence to retain the negroes in the South. So I say a great deal of notice is being taken of it. Some Southern white men are saying that the negro must have a different sort of treatment. I do not say that. I take that from

the Southern papers, and I am ready to let them say that. They are awakening to the situation, and it may be only the beginning of the awakening. That is an actual fact, and it is to be reckoned with. Men are going to think about it. They are thinking about it, and thinking will generate action. There is another thing to which allusion has been made more than once in the progress of this debate, and that is the fact, a comparatively recent fact, it appears to me, that the labor unions are receiving colored men into their membership.

E. B. Chappell: They have been doing that for a long time.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: It was stated in our General Conference at Saratoga that the labor unions would not accept colored men.

Edwin M. Randall: The American Federation of Labor took it up and worked on it for months after our meeting at Saratoga.

E. B. Chappell: Twelve or thirteen years ago I attended the meeting of a labor union, and a negro sat in the meeting. That is all I know about it.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: There is another thing that is comparatively recent, although "comparatively" may cover an indefinite space of time, and that is the organization of the Sociological Congress, an organization of sociological workers in Southern schools, including both white and colored people in its membership. They meet not merely for the study of sociological questions, but for the study of this particular question in its relation to Southern life and especially to Southern community life. Now, if anybody thinks that is going to leave things just where they are, I think he is devoid of imagination. There is a new situation in education in the South, which is of comparatively recent development, caused by the increasing number of inspectors of colored schools who are being appointed and who are discovering deficiencies which they report as perfectly alarming, but which have not been very much known. There is an awakening consciousness on the subject of schools for the colored people, and there is a new era for colored children in the schools of the South. I do not think it is going to be possible for this new program of education, this new program of sociological study, and this union of blacks and whites in the labor unions and in the discussion of sociological questions as they will surely come up, to leave things as they are. I do not believe that you are going to be able to keep the negro out of your political life as has been in the past by any process under the sun. So, if there be a fixed determination, as some of the brethren have said, that there shall not be any participation of the negro in government, you certainly have problems before you. You may attempt to hold these people in this position, but there will be

increasing difficulty with the passing of the years until it becomes absolutely impossible. I do not know whether I am imagining too much or not, but I have a kind of feeling that when the young men from the South who have gone to France and who have been thinking seriously about democracy, as they have never thought before, come back, they will not come back exactly the same. I have a fancy that the progress of this movement will be tremendously accelerated when they do come back, and I am believing with a profound conviction that just now the great thing for the negro in the South is to be patient and intent, for a new dispensation in the South for the negro is beginning to dawn. That brings up the very vital question, What place is the Church going to take in this movement? Shall we let the school and the State take up this business and attend to it while the Church stands off and has no share in it? I think every one of us is aware of a suspicion abroad that the Church is a little too much detached from the real questions among which we live now, that it is out of contact, that we are calling on people to be converted to something that means nothing much to-day or to-morrow except some imaginary or sentimental change. I hear indirectly of complaints that come to us from the army that many of our preachers, and some too whose names stand in high repute, are missing the mark entirely, and that while the Young Men's Christian Associations get the boys the preachers do not. There is that feeling that the Church is detached. Now, it seems to me that as this movement goes forward, as I confidently believe it is going forward, it will be unspeakably depressing if the Churches of Jesus Christ, and the Methodist Church in particular, have to be dragged after the procession, resisting the movement all the time. That is the way I feel about it. Since this movement is on, the thing for the Methodist Episcopal Church to do is to take the flag of the cross of Jesus Christ and carry it at the head of the procession to say that in a movement for the enlargement of human life, for the greater liberty of it, for the larger activity of it, in a movement like that the cross of Jesus Christ goes at the front and we go there with it. Now, if you will permit me, I would like to talk a few moments about the concrete propositions before us. I would not like to leave that out entirely. There is a proposition not officially presented in any report of any committee, but which in a way is before us officially, the proposition for an independent Church. I think it has generally been conceded that in a legal way that is impossible. I have been a little surprised that we have not seen other impossibilities. I think it is a little because we may not have once stopped to put that proposition squarely before us and to see what it means. Now, I have to speak a little bit plainly, and I think I ought to, because I am not sure that a little clearing of

the ground is not wanted at this point. I wonder, if it had been realized that a proposition of this sort is virtually a proposition to unite with part of our membership, whether it would ever have been put up to us. Would you have said, We are willing to unite with a part of your Church, but you must allow us to choose which part? I am perfectly satisfied that if that were put to us there would be just one answer returned to the negotiation. We would never have gone forward on a proposition of that sort. I don't think you would have expected us to begin negotiations on a proposition of that sort. It is an impossibility in its very terms. It is useless to say that this plan would lead to a more liberal policy for the negro. If we should agree on such a thing as that, I fancy that at first there would be a tremendous outburst of enthusiasm with large contributions, that afterwards the contributions would gradually begin to fade until at length this truly disconnected organization would become just as much disconnected from our pocketbooks as from our Church itself. There is also the proposition of the Associate Regional Conference, which to my mind has objections. One of them is that it makes no provision whatever for colored constituency of the Southern Church, but practically excludes them. The proposition that is before us carries with it a representation of negro delegates which to my mind is a weak and colorless affair, a merely nominal representation, particularly when you include the fact that there is no provision made whatever for any vote upon constitutional questions. Permit me to say that I have serious doubts whether anything can be passed that will be constitutional which will prevent the negro from voting on constitutional changes. I think we are compelled to put them in. The sole merit of that plan, and I think it is a merit, is that it preserves a certain corporate connection and coöperation between the colored and white people of Methodism, and that to my mind is an essential thing to preserve. There is something about that relation which nothing else quite meets. It is perfectly natural for our colored people to go into the congregations of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, more freely than into our own, and yet they feel in their relations to us that they are part of our Church. They are responsible to it and the Church is responsible to and for them, and they have a relation to it that they could not have otherwise. I trust that the colored Methodists will never get out of that relation with the white Methodists in this country. The dream of my life has been, since I was able to read the debates of 1844, when the Church became two, to see the day when it is one; but in all that time I have had a vision of one Methodism, not two. My idea has been that Methodism is large and comprehensive in its spirit and organization and that every Methodist in the United States, without any

reference to whatever color or race, should be a part of one great Methodism, that all these different branches should be gathered into one. There is not a single reason which demands a union of the white Methodisms in the United States that does not demand a union of all branches of Methodism. If the colored people are to have a satisfactory part in the redemption of the world, they should get themselves together and address themselves to it unitedly, but I do not think it would be wise or that it would be best for them to do that in absolute separation from us. Now, there is no man who believes more profoundly than I do in race consciousness. It is a fact with which we are obliged to reckon. If any man seeks to inform us of the fact that we have a color line in the Methodist Episcopal Church, he is wasting valuable time. We know it. But this thing I would like to say, and this thing ought to be forever true concerning Methodism. We did not make a separate place for the colored man and say that he shall occupy that. I understand that we have a certain situation in Chicago which is being handled with perfect ease. There came up a difficulty over housing for the colored people who have come among us in such numbers. They have come in during the last year to the number of seventy-five thousand. They have poured into some quarters of the city like a flood. White residents have been displaced in solid blocks, and their places have been taken by colored tenants. There were white people who didn't like it when the colored tenants came into their neighborhood. There were real estate agents who had houses to rent, and they found the rental value of those houses depreciated by the fact that they were surrounded by negroes. The complaint got into the papers and into public discussion and created more or less friction. Then, some people said—some colored people—"Now, you white folks needn't be so uppish about this; we don't want to live with you any more than you want to live with us, and if you will fix a certain part of the city and give us the kind of houses to live in that we want, we shall be glad to take them," and they appointed a committee to work out an agreement, and that was done. So, through the co-operation of the two people, without any wrong of any sort, they worked out that problem to the common satisfaction of all. That, in my judgment, is what ought to be done everywhere. So I am in favor of the admission of all the colored Methodists, because I believe it to be the best thing for everybody concerned that there should be an Associate General Conference and that it shall be closely tied in a connectional way with the great body of the Church, that it should combine autonomy and connectionalism; but I would not force that upon the negro if he did not like it, because it is a thing we cannot afford to do for the sake of the kingdom of God and for the sake of those black

people, and it would create a suspicion that we are trying to force something on them because we have power. I wish they would agree with me; but if they don't, that is their misfortune. It is my honest belief that we have not merely a matter that deals with this colored population, but applies to all the other races.

Abram W. Harris: I feel a good deal frightened in coming to this matter, and I ask your forbearance. I shall try not to tax your patience very long. I am not quite sure why I am frightened. I have come to know you pretty well, and if I were to be frank I would say there are not a great many of you that I am afraid of; and I only put that qualifying phrase in to give some of you comfort, if it is any comfort. I think this is the reason why I am frightened a little. I think it was in 1844, perhaps 1845, that either Clay or Calhoun, I am not able to remember which, speaking in the United States Senate, said something like this:

The States divided by their local interests are bound into unity by many ties. Among those, some of the strongest are the great Churches that stretch from East to West and North to South. And now the largest of these, the Methodist Episcopal Church, has been broken, and as I look into the future I fear that it is only the first of many to be broken until at last the Constitution itself shall be broken and the Union severed.

And we know how truly he spoke. Then came on the glorious war. A dreadful war it was; but I know of no war, unless it be that of to-day, which had in it more of generosity in the end and more of high purpose all through it. I am proud of the people who followed Lee, and I love the people who followed Abraham Lincoln through all those four years in the sixties. And out of that war there came to the world—not only to the United States of America, but to the whole world—a great tribute, a reunited United States of America, the finest example that the world has ever known, if I read history aright, of a league for the enforcement of peace. Now, we are told this very night that the labor union has won, after years, a victory which the Church yet waits for. Not only do we deal in these days with matters of interest to severed Methodism, but I verily believe it is given to you and me, if we will, to play a part, a man's part, and to do a great bit for the Stars and Stripes. You know, I cannot tell how this thing is coming out. I have been a persistent optimist, and I hope to show you before I am through why I have been such an optimist. Now, I am going to read you a little poem. It is a rule of mine to try to keep my mind fresh by reading a little poetry every day. I have been living entirely on prose during these meetings; but finally I went all the way down to the public library and got three books: one by a man who has written the greatest prayers of modern times. I wish that we might use some of them at our meetings. Then I got a book of

child verse. I don't think many of you have run across this—but before I read the one I have in mind here is one that you probably all know. You will certainly recognize it:

The rain is raining all around,
It falls on field and tree;
It rains on the umbrellas here,
And on the ships at sea.

I think if I could do a thing like that I would be able to solve the problem of unification. But here is the thing that I wanted to read:

Dark brown is the river,
Golden is the sand.
It flows along forever,
With trees on either hand.

Green leaves a-floating,
Castles of the foam,
Boats of mine a-boating,
Where will all come home?

On goes the river,
And out past the mill,
Away down the valley,
Away down the hill.

Away down the river,
A hundred miles or more,
Other little children
Shall bring my boats ashore.

And those children are going to bring ashore the boats that you and I may put out in these days upon the great river that flows by our door. It frightens me, but I will do the best I can with it. I hope you like the poetry. There used to be a man who came around Middletown when I was a student. I can't think of his name. He used to lecture at the gymnasium. I don't think I remember anything he said except when he got halfway through he would say, "How do you like it as far as I have got?" Now, I am going to make a few general statements at the beginning so that you will know I mean well. I may say something you don't like, but if I could avoid it I would do so. It has never been pleasant to me to say unpleasant things except when I was in an unpleasant humor. In the first place, I wish I knew what God wants me to do. But I do not, so I am not going to talk much about that. Bishop McDowell has a great sermon about "When the sower went forth to sow." I remember the end of it is "and he did what he went to do." It is a great big text, and I am inclined to think that the sermon is as great as the text. Now, all I can say is that just so far as I know how, I am going to do what I have been sent to do. I am not sure I am right; but so far as I can see, I will do what I think

is right. In the next place, I am not going to take any time to try to balance the merits and demerits of the North and the South. I have no doubt you have some demerits. I know we have plenty, and if you lack any we will give you some. But I will say this to you also: I am sure that you have also got the merits of the Anglo-Saxon, for I have known a great many fine Yankees like you Southerners, only they live up North. There is no difference between the Yankees and the Southerners except where they put their feet—whether under or on the table—and if you come up North we will make good Yankees out of you. In the next place, I am not going to argue the question on the score of its being good for the negro. I used to have croup when I was a boy, and the remedy was ipecac. I got so I would nearly throw up if I walked through the room where the bottle was, but my mother used to comfort me by saying she gave it to me for my good. It will be a long sight safer if we settle this issue not only for the good of the negro but for our own good as well. I am looking out as hard as I can for every man, woman, and child in the Methodist Episcopal Church, whether you stick a South or a North on him, or whether you call him black or white. In particular, however, I am looking out for people who are nearest me. What is that the Scripture says about taking care of people nearest you? Motives can get horribly mixed up. I have known of men getting \$50,000 a year salary, and they would persuade themselves that they only did it for the benefit of the poor. Now, let us from this time forth not be so high. Let us get down on a lower plane. I had a row with a man about collections once. We have a curious arrangement of taking up only one educational collection for the common use of the local society and of the Board of Education to be used for general benevolent purposes. I say that is quite a tax on a man's Christian character. At one time a collection was so worked around that the college got \$11,000 and the Board got \$20. When I broached the matter, a representative of the college talked to me a great deal about it, trying to explain that it was right. Then he said he would "deal generously with me," etc., and I said: "I don't want you to deal generously with me. I want you to give the Board what belongs to it—not generosity, but justice." I have heard some one say that the greatest thing in the world is love; but I think in this day and age the greatest common virtue is justice, and there is no permanent success for any Church in this land that cannot find a way to be just to the humblest under the flag. That is what we have to find somehow or other, and be just to ourselves, too. Now, you cannot get ideal conditions. I do not expect them; but we must make sure that we are going on toward perfection and not erecting barriers that will stop progress forever. If we do that, our very children

will rise up, not to praise this meeting but to condemn it. Now, I said there was a mixture of motives. I want to make this last general observation: We want unification, and the North has always wanted unification. We talk as if the North freed the slaves, as if the war was fought for the freedom of the slaves. The war *resulted* in the freedom of the slaves, but it was *fought* for the union. We never took up arms until somebody fired on the United States, and then the North fought for union. We love unification; we would rather fight you than not be united with you. You know sometimes I have felt here that I would rather fight some of you unto death than not to be united with you. But I promised to get through in a hurry, and I have only got through with my general observation. Now, I thought we ought to have a text—a slogan—and I think I can suggest one here. I think that every time any one rises to a question of personal privilege I should just shout "Forget it." We cannot waste any more time on it. Actually it took me, as Secretary, longer to write out the record of personal privileges than it did all you said about unification and a larger Christianity. Now, we are pretty much the same. I look around at the Southerners, and I know they are struck on themselves sometimes. But you can't say that you are any better looking than our set. There are just as many bald heads on your side as on ours. Now, we are like you in some respects. The negro has given us some trouble—not a great deal. I hear it more about the time of General Conference when they are electing bishops. The darky is very much interested in elections, and we had a case up which has been to me a joy ever since. I heard one of our bishops, one of the most eloquent bishops, tell me this, so it must be true. I ask to be corrected if I am not correct in what I saw. We had in one of our Conferences a foreigner, a German. The Germans wanted a German bishop and the negroes wanted a negro bishop, and this German was a good politician. He had learned his lesson in efficiency. He went to the people in Southern California and asked whether there was any man in Southern California that wanted to be a bishop. They said there was not, and he said they ought to have one. Then he went to the negroes and said they ought to have a bishop. He arranged matters so that when they started into the election they elected the German. They put him over. Then something happened to the program, and the negro bishop was not elected. The negro candidate for bishop didn't like it very well, and he got up to tell the General Conference what had been going on. Bishop Cranston was presiding, and he saw what was coming, so he headed the man off: Thank the Lork for a bishop that has some acumen. This negro came pretty near telling what he thought about that German. A delegate said, "Do you know what N— means?" (N— was

not his name.) Another delegate said, "He means, damn the Dutch." I wonder what would have happened if the brother had said it. That has troubled us very much; still we had a good time of it. But let me call your attention to the fact that the negro didn't make that trouble: it was the Dutchman. Now, every time there has been any trouble with the negroes somehow or another there is a white man in the woodpile. In the next place, I want to say, and I wish I could put this matter to sleep forever, that the North has no use for social equality, and I am going to suggest another phase. I am going to say "common social life." It is not polite to talk about equality between gentlemen. I have a granddaughter. I suppose some of you have granddaughters, but I'll bet you that your granddaughter is not as pretty as mine or as smart as mine, and I'll win every time if you will let me be the judge. And I will say that I would give everything I have in the world, my life included, for the sake of that little two-year-old girl who calls me "Da-Da-Dee." I have bought a lot of expensive things in my life, but I never had anything half so fine as she. Why, if she were in danger of marrying a colored man, I would rather see her in her grave. Judge White told the truth, and I don't like his truth; but I know what he meant, and I hope Dr. Jones and Dr. Penn will understand what I have just said, and if they have the proper spirit of manhood in them I know that they wouldn't want one of their daughters to marry a white man either. There's no use talking to me on that score. Our treatment of the negro question has been pretty much the same after all. He has been segregated, and the negroes segregate themselves in Conferences. I do not know who it was that brought in the word "nexus"—I hate it—but it is useful, and I may say that we have a "nexus" in the Conferences. We send a white bishop to preside over colored Conferences. It is good for the bishop, and I am sure it is good for the colored Conference. There is no better missionary work you men can do than to get into some of these colored Conferences. It seems to me that if I were a Southern bishop living in the Southland and wanted to do missionary work for the Master I would not want anything better than to get into those colored Conferences. Don't waste your time on aristocratic Southerners, they'll get to heaven anyway—I hope. Now, the only difference between your method and ours is when you get up to the General Conference—there we have a parallel, I like that better—it is a place where they talk. Have any of you been hurt talking in the presence of Brothers Jones and Penn—has it hurt any of you to hear Brothers Jones and Penn? I have enjoyed these speeches, but there has not been any better speech made than Dr. Jones made, and it didn't hurt me, and I think there is nothing better for men who get across each other than to sit down and talk.

Our General Conference talks, and I hear foolish people complaining about it talking too long. I think the more talk and the less voting the better. But I think it is best for every man there to have a vote if he has a ticket of admission showing that he is entitled to be there; and if any man cannot maintain his position against the black man's vote, he had better let somebody else take his place. Above everything, let us play fair. One of the finest things about athletics is that it teaches the boys fair play, and you old duffers who are growing heavy in old age look out for the youngsters; they are getting their education on the football field, and you must obey the settled sporting rules or you will be ruled out as the years roll by. We believe every man should start at the same place at the drop of the same handkerchief, and the prize shall go to the winner, the fellow who gets to the end first. I rather like it, but I won't insist on using it yet. There may be difficulties. I am patient, I will wait; but our General Conference is the "nexus," the nexus between the colored man and us. He has a right to do as he pleases about his everyday life, and once every four years he comes up and talks a little in the General Conference. Now, this is not so much a matter of religion as of government. We talk about the separation of the Church and State, and that is true; but the man who says the expression "Church and State" means that religion and politics have nothing to do with each other has not looked very far into history. The divine right of kings and the divine right of bishops are only two sides of the same thing, and when Luther broke the power of the pope he set going forces that sooner or later will make the whole world democratic. I am not worrying in this country about Roman Catholics. I hear men get up and preach sermons about them. Let them alone. The liberty spirit of the country makes a Protestant out of every Catholic whether he will or no; most of the Catholics vote our ticket, at least up North they do.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: What is your ticket?

Abram W. Harris: I am a Progressive Democrat.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: As usual, standing alone.

Abram W. Harris: I hope not. Now, in politics we have in this country two forces, a centripetal and a centrifugal force; one that tends to bring us together and one that tends to separate us. In other words, we have the National Government and then we have the Local Government. I sometimes think that the great genius of the Anglo-Saxon is his ability to be inconsistent. It is sometimes ridiculous. We pass laws in our General Conference which are supposed to be representative. It is a law against a certain amusement, say, and we never enforce it in a single case. There are objections to it. That is a good illustration of the Anglo-Saxon on the bad side of him. We pass laws,

but we don't believe in enforcing them every day. It means patience. If we are going to succeed in the government or in the State, you must recognize those two principles that are provided for in advance. Now, here is the General Conference. Then there is the Regional Conference. That is the big thing in the locality. Sone one asked, If we had only one General Conference, what would we do if a lot of negroes colonized the Church? I do not know that they would get quite to that proposition, but they seem to think that they might take the Church away. The General Conference has nothing to do with that. The Regional Conference must take care of that. If you folks in Savannah cannot keep them away from the negroes, go up and ask the Regional Conference, and they'll take care of you. They'll do about what you want. I don't know how many votes there will be, but you and I know you have a bigger representation in Congress in proportion to the votes that you have than the State of New York has. Now the constitution says—

H. H. White: We are willing to give it up if you repeal the amendment.

A. W. Harris: Why not? Because we hold so dear the principle of leaving State matters to the State that we would rather lose representation than to make a fight for it. I think no sentiment came over me so strongly when Judge White read his paper as this. I said, "That is a hard condition," and I recalled the great poem about the white man's burden. It is a humiliating situation, an unfortunate one, and I am not sure but my brethren of the North ought to unite with me with at least a feeling of gratitude that Providence has not put evenly on our shoulders what that man bears. I do not know whether he is bearing it the best way or not, but I am glad I don't have to decide. And it is a fine thing in our situation that we can fit ourselves to such conditions as that, and woe to us of the Methodist Episcopal Church if in our new organization we do not well preserve the balance. Before us we have a fine example, and we are very dull if we have not learned our lesson. There are some sovereign facts that we might just as well recognize. This negro question is no dream, no nightmare. It is a sovereign fact. I have no belief that any civilized community or body of adequate men will yield over the government to an even larger group of uncultured and illiterate men. In some way they'll find how to bring control of the State to the men best qualified to control the State. They will not succeed all the time, but in general they will reach it. But I must say that in this solution I would feel tremendously discouraged if I thought Judge White's solution was universal or perpetual. It is only a poor beginning. I hope that there may some day be a satisfactory ending. After all, it is not so much in the point you have attained as in the distance you have

gone which indicates whether you have made a long run. Now, let me bring to your attention a thing to which Bishop McDowell has already called attention. You must not let this get out of your mind. These 300,000 negroes are not to be taken into the Church. They are in, and in the first place I don't see any way to get them out without their consent. If they would choose to go out, all right; but they do not choose, and I think if I were a colored man I would not choose either. I would stand where I am. Let me tell you a story about an old colored man who in discussing this question rose in a congregation in Washington and said, "I love the Methodist Episcopal Church." I don't want to talk with any tears in my voice, but they almost come when I say that. He is so like me when he says that that it is difficult to keep my eyes clear. I love it because it was my father's and my mother's Church. I so love it that if by going out I could make the rest better I would gladly go. To the Church of my love I will give even my membership if it is for her good, but I cannot give my membership alone. If I give my membership, I give my son's and his son's and his son's son's forever, and no man has a right to give away his children's inheritance in so sacred a thing. Where the colored man is in the Methodist Episcopal Church, he must stay; and, much as I love my own Church, much as I am anxious for unification, I cannot with self-respect buy that at the cost of those already in if there is no legal way to get them out. I would like to refer the matter to the lawyers. Is there any way by constitutional process to get them out?

E. C. Reeves: Is it not rather a question of going in? I will have to go out of my Church and go into the new Church, and the negro will do the same. Is it not a question of going in and not a question of going out?

Abram W. Harris: In 1884 there was a big lawsuit and we up North tried to prove that you went out; but you whipped us, and the Supreme Court of the United States said you did not go out.

E. C. Reeves: If we agree to go out, we are out, and then we'll have the new Church.

Abram W. Harris: Is there any way through constitutional process by which you can put a man out of the Church? You may try to put him out. I do not know, but I very much doubt whether you can get the negro out unless he chooses to go.

H. H. White: You could go out and leave him.

Abram W. Harris: Now, there is a sentimental consideration that I think is impossible. We cannot afford on either side to buy unification at the cost of self-respect, and I cannot desert the negro and keep my self-respect. It may not be deser-

tion, but I feel that way. There was a negro who made a tremendous impression in one of the General Conferences and this was his peroration. It begins with the words of Ruth:

And Ruth said, Entreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee: for whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God; where thou diest, will I die, and there will I be buried.

If those 300,000 negroes were your negroes, what would you do? But I must hurry along. Now, what is the real remedy? I think this is the real remedy. We may not be able to get to it at once, but we ought to work toward it and to avoid all occasion for trouble, and in it the negro ought not to have to carry the burden. The negro is not to blame for this situation. We white people ought to carry the heavy end of the load and not the light one. I saw a thing in the papers today that pleased me very much. The American troops had come into Paris and two little French girls were standing watching them go by. They saw the Stars and Stripes and one little girl said, "Which is the handsomest flag?" "I think the American flag is." The other little girl said, "Oh, no, the French flag is the handsomest." "Well," said the other little girl, "at any rate the American flag is the kindest flag." It made me feel good. I would rather have the kindest flag any time than the handsomest flag, and the best way to solve the negro problem is the kindest way. We had better sit down with him once in a while and run all the risks of the social side than to try force. Never use force when even-handed justice will do better. I may be an idealist, but I never said anything that I didn't mean; and the thing to do now, according to my notion, is to take them all, the black man and Chinaman and all the rest of them, and we will make no mistake. Do you remember that great speech of Webster and that great paragraph of his, beginning something about the mariner—that when he came out of the storm the first thing to do was to take his bearings? Now, it behooves us to do the very same thing now; we should take our bearings and see where we stand; we have been wandering all over the face of the earth. We have been covering a good many things and I think it is worth while to spend a minute or two to find just where we are, and I want you to be patient with me while I read two or three things. This matter we are dealing with began in Chattanooga. Now listen carefully. Here is what the Chattanooga Conference said: "We suggest that the governing power of the reorganized Church shall be vested in one General Conference." That leads me to suggest—I have an objection to that Associate General Conference. I do not know what an Associate General

Conference is. And when you get to having an Associate General Conference, how is it one? This, it says, shall be vested in "one General Conference." And when you come to approve the Constitution, do you have to have a vote in the General Conference? If you do, the negro will have a bigger vote than ever:

We suggest that the governing power of the reorganized Church shall be vested in one General Conference and three or four Quadrennial Conferences, both General and Quadrennial Conferences to exercise their powers under constitutional provisions and restrictions, the General Conference to have full legislative power over all matters distinctively connectional, and the Quadrennial Conferences to have full legislative power over distinctively local affairs.

Now, listen to this:

We suggest that the colored membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Protestant Church, and such organizations of colored Methodists as may enter into agreement with them may be constituted and recognized as one of the Quadrennial or Jurisdictional Conferences of the proposed reorganization.

That is significant only because it is referred to in what I read now. This action was taken in Oklahoma City. Here is what the South said:

The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, regards the unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Protestant Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, by the plan proposed by the Joint Commission on Federation, as feasible and desirable, and hereby declares itself in favor of the unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in accordance with this general plan of reorganization.

Now, I omit a paragraph.

However, we recommend that the colored membership of the various Methodist bodies be formed into an independent organization holding fraternal relations with the reorganized and united Church.

I take the liberty of repeating a little in regard to the "one General Conference." The Oklahoma Conference said this: "It hereby declares itself in favor of unification of the two Churches in accordance with the general plan of reorganization." That seems to be a definite instruction, and I would suppose it to mean that that plan was laid down and that the Southern Commissioners were expected to follow instructions. Here is another matter. It is the recommendation, and only a recommendation, "that the colored membership of the various Methodist bodies be formed into an independent organization." You may notice that that is "various" colored bodies, not only the 300,000 members of the Methodist Episcopal Church. It was the ideal to be reached when all the colored people were brought together and there were many to be assimilated. Now, let me read what happened at Saratoga:

The Methodist Episcopal Church [notice the similarity of wording] regards the unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the Methodist Protestant Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, by the plan proposed by the Joint Commissioners on Federation, as feasible and desirable, and hereby declares itself in favor of the unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, in accordance with this general plan of reorganization, with the following recommendations.

In other words, each Commission seems to have been instructed to bring about a reorganization based upon a general plan which was approved by the General Conferences, so that we do not need to approve it, as I understand. And then there were certain recommendations on which we were to have a large amount of liberty. This is the secret of my optimism. Now, I think I shall have to stop because my voice is giving out.

John M. Moore: I move that we adjourn with Brother Harris having the floor to-morrow.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Commission then adjourned after benediction by Dr. Chappell.

SEVENTH DAY, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 30, 1918.

MORNING SESSION.

The meeting was called to order by Bishop McDowell.

The hymn, "Come, thou Fount of every blessing," was sung.

Prayers were offered by Judge Walton and Mr. Simpson and then responsive reading.

The hymn, "Praise God, from whom all blessings flow," was sung.

The roll was called and the following were present: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke, Collins Denny, Edwin D. Mouzon, W. B. Murrah, James Atkins. Ministers: Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, Edwin M. Randall, Claudius B. Spencer, Joseph W. Van Cleve, John J. Wallace, F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, John M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar. Laymen: G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, H. W. Rogers, Alex. Simpson, Jr., R. V. Watt, C. M. Stuart, James R. Joy, Charles A. Pollock.

The journal of the last session was read and approved.

The Chairman: Dr. Harris has the floor.

Abram W. Harris: When we adjourned last night I was reading some of the record, and in order to get going I am

going to ask your indulgence that I go back and take a little run before making my jump. That is not the whole of my purpose. I would like to give those who are not here a chance to arrive because all I have said before is preliminary. Have you ever thought of the name of this Commission—the Commission on Unification? It would seem to me very appropriate, but not yet justified. There has been a lot of Commission, but I am not sure that there has been a great deal of Unification yet, and as my little Church put the word “on” in the middle it has been suggested that we might improve the name if we would use a little more Methodist term. (Somebody said a fish always remained a fish. Well, if I am a fish I have no desire to be a whale, and it would be of little consequence if I did want to be a whale.) I wonder how it would do to take something that has been often suggested to me and say that this is not a Committee on Unification. We have been sitting on this too tight for that, and somebody might suggest that we call it a “Commission going on Unification.” If we do not get to the end of the road, it is not of any consequence whether we have run while we were on the way or not, for, after all, the prize goes to the winner, not to somebody who ran well part of the way. He may run very well part of the way, but if he does not reach the goal some other man gets the cup. Now, I want to apologize; I don’t feel much like it, but it is a fashion to apologize. Judge Reeves asked me a question and I think I dismissed it in too much of a hurry. He asked me whether we were not all going to be out and then all come in. It occurred to me that he also said something about a car.

E. C. Reeves: I said you have the right machinery, but hitched on to the wrong car.

Abram W. Harris: I think that is true. We are hitched on to the wrong engine, and so are you. We have two engines and there is only one Methodist Episcopal Church. You may call it by one name in one place and another name in another; but, after all, it is only one Church, and stubborn facts show that you cannot keep the two trains running all the time. I don’t care whether you get out and get in or not, but the important thing is to hitch the two trains up together with one engine. And I have had a chance to see Brother Jones during the night and I have looked at his ticket; it is just like mine, and when we get on we are both going to the end of the road. Now, I am coming back to rather more serious things. I am obliged to read over again the action of that Commission at Chattanooga, although I think you remember it. I will just read the important words, because I think they set down things that are more important than anything else I can say. I will only

read two or three lines. You will remember the rest. Here is what they say: "We suggest that the governing power of the reorganized Church shall be vested in one General Conference and three or four Quadrennial Conferences." There were very wise men at Chattanooga and not all of one mind. I know that because Bishop Cranston was there and so was Bishop Denny. They may be one in spirit, but they had more than one mind. Among others was Bishop A. W. Wilson. I heard him talk. I don't know him very well except as I have heard of him. The address I quote from is the only address I ever heard him make. He said: "I prefer the Churches as they are." That was rather killing to us—and then he went on and said another thing: "My General Conference has given me instructions and I propose to obey orders." I don't wonder that some of you have a fine admiration for Bishop Wilson. It is an easy thing to come down to fight for the kind of unification you want, but it requires a good deal more of a man to come down and fight for the kind of unification you are told to fight for and not try to fix it over again. As I understand it, Bishop Wilson did not quite vote for this report, but he agreed not to vote against it. Then we come to the action of the Churches.

Bishop Denny: While it is a little out of order, will you allow me to correct the statement—an understanding, rather, that is really a misunderstanding? Bishop Wilson left the meeting at Chattanooga about the third, or maybe the second, day of the meeting. He was sick. He sent for me, told me he was going, and said: "I want to leave in the hands of Bishop Hoss, Dr. Thomas, and you my vote in case my vote should be necessary." We had agreed upon nothing and had voted upon nothing when he left. Bishop Hoss and I could not agree on some of the matters. The consequence was that Bishop Wilson's vote was never cast for anything connected with the Chattanooga meeting. In weal or woe, that is the fact. Inasmuch as there has been a somewhat different understanding, I think that should be made a matter of record.

Abram W. Harris: That will leave me to go over what I have said and substitute Bishop Denny instead of Bishop Wilson, except that I said I didn't know Bishop Wilson very well. I know Bishop Denny, and like him. Now, I want to say what the Methodist Episcopal Church said. They said the same thing. I read first what the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, said and I wish you to give close attention, because this is a matter of importance:

The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, regards the unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Protestant Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, by the plan proposed by the Joint Commission on Federation, as feasible and desirable, and hereby declares

itself in favor of the unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in accordance with this general plan of reorganization.

We have been going quite far afield as if we were the only people, and that is not at all correct. The fact is, I understand that there were something like 320 delegates to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, which met a while ago in the city of Oklahoma. They did something toward unification; and I say this in all kindness to the brothers of the South, "I challenge you to make that statement good." If you had not said that, I am very, very sure there would have been no unanimous vote at Saratoga. We are here prepared to make good what we said at Saratoga to the last word, and I am sure you are here prepared to make good every line and word that your General Conference said in Oklahoma City. And if we will do that, I don't care if you want an Associate General Conference or not, I'll take it. I don't like the Associate General Conference. You know that. Some one said, "You object to the name," and then asked me a very impolite question. He said, "If you don't like that name, can you suggest a name?" And I said, "I can; if we are going to have another name for the colored people, we ought to have another name for the white people, so I suggest, not Associate General Conference, but Associate Miss General Conference and white Mr. General Conference. I venture, if we have the two names, call the negro Miss and the white Mr." Now, I wonder if we haven't been biting off more than we can chew? Some of the work has been done following these two General Conferences. What do you think is the most generous thing said here and who said it? You know I think Dr. Jones said the most generous thing, and I don't believe I could have said it if I were in his place. If we give the colored men in the General Conference representation in proportion to membership, we have been reminded that there are not very many of them. As fishers of men in a black pool we haven't been very successful. There is something wrong with the bait, I suspect. They have only thirty representatives out of 600 or 800.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: There will be 700.

Abram W. Harris: They ought to have about thirty, and yet Dr. Jones said he would give up some of the thirty if that would help the thing out. I do not know whether he did that for the good of the colored man or the good of the white man. I have never felt in these meetings quite so much humiliated as at that time when out of his thirty he held out some to me. I have some pride—I suppose I ought to have. It was very hard when they brought into this country the fee system; but I

have got used to it, although I have never taken one. Don't you know I am a white man, and I will not take anything from the colored man? If these are your votes, keep them. I don't want the colored man's vote for myself, but if you men of the South think it will help out I'll take them and never talk about it again. I will say that things have happened that I never did expect to happen. It was a white man, God bless him, who delivered them from horrible slavery; but I never expected to live to see the time come when, as has been here, it would be for the black man to deliver the white man from slavery. Yet, I am ready, if we can only get out of this bondage, to go out under the leadership of a black man. What shall the end be? Will you be willing for me to stop now just with some prayers? If you will, I am going to say two prayers. I didn't make either one of them. I am somewhat of a ritualist. You will make me very sad if you take that word "Episcopal" out of the name of the united Church. It goes back a long ways and I like sometimes what they call the written prayers, because they have been in the mouths of so many Christians of all ages. One of the prayers goes almost back to the beginning of the Church. Then there is another one that goes back even to the days of our Lord himself, so that when we say it, we say over again throughout all the ages that prayer with Him. And this is the first sentence of it. It begins with the word "prevent," which does not mean what "prevent" now means. It means "lead": "Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings with thy most gracious favor, and further us with thy continual help that in all our work begun, continued, and ended in thee, we may glorify thy holy name and finally by thy mercy obtain everlasting life." And then this other: "Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come; thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven; give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory. Amen."

John F. Goucher: We have had somewhat of history, somewhat of psychology, somewhat of philosophy, and somewhat of metaphysics, and a good many other things, and seem to be working in an area of low visibility. To my thinking there are two facts which we ought to recognize, two questions which we ought to answer clearly and specifically, and these are, Who are we? and what is our function and responsibility? These questions, it seems to me, have been obscured by the biography, the history, and the other things with which we have been regaled, and it seems to me, before we can proceed definitely and constructively with our work, we must clearly perceive who we are

and what are our functions and obligations. We are a Joint Commission, not members of separate Commissions that have incidentally come together. We are a Joint Commission, and as a Joint Commission we should have a clearly defined and clearly perceived self-consciousness—that is, a Joint Commission consciousness—that we may know exactly who we are, and this may help us to define what our functions are. The two great branches of American Methodism are officially represented by three organizations, absolutely distinct as to functions and responsibility. Leading these three organizations is this Joint Commission; second, the two General Conferences; and third, 175, more or less, Annual Conferences. Neither of these may infringe upon the rights of the others without violating the proprieties. Therefore, we should understand just who we are. We are neither a General Conference nor an Annual Conference. We are the Joint Commission on Unification. That is, I think, set forth with great definiteness in the action of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, which says:

Such Commission on Unification as may be appointed shall report to the next General Conference the full details of the plan of unification which may be agreed upon by the Joint Commission on Unification [not by the separate Commissions] for its consideration and final determination.

Observe, “for its consideration and final determination.” Our action here is not a final action. We must report to the General Conferences a plan, not necessarily *the* plan—the organizations are separate and distinct; each has his own clearly defined functions, as is manifest in that action I just read to you, and there was a similar action passed by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. We, as a Joint Commission, are simply to prepare a plan, not necessarily *the* plan, for reorganization and report the same to the next General Conferences for consideration and final determination. If it receives the constitutional majority in the next General Conference, it will be referred to the Annual Conferences. They conjointly, the General Conferences and the Annual Conferences, must determine the final plan. We are to prepare a plan for the consideration of the General Conference. In this we are to interpret our best judgment as to the adjustment of reorganized American Methodism to the trend of the present and probable demands of the future, subordinating everything in ourselves, our judgment, our preferences, our appreciation of earlier adjustments, everything to the guidance of the Holy Spirit. We are to act as a Joint Commission. That to me seems to be a very important and significant fact. As an entity, individually we are here as members of a Joint Commission. No one holds a brief, and

all of us together do not hold a brief to interpret the General Conferences which are to meet. They have not vacated their special prerogatives nor any of their responsibilities, but have very definitely assigned to us our specific task—namely, to submit to them, for their consideration and for their final determination, a plan of reorganization. I think we have been assuming to ourselves too large a sense of responsibility. We have heard a great deal about what the General Conferences will do, and what the General Conferences will not do, and what the Annual Conferences of our people will do, and what the Annual Conferences of our people will not do. They are of age. Their proper limitations and responsibilities are fixed, as ours are. This trinity of organizations, this Joint Commission, the two General Conferences, and the Annual Conferences, each has a specific and vital relationship to this plan. It is not necessary to add to the burdens we feel or to try to get under responsibilities that do not belong to us; we are already overburdened with responsibility. We should not enlarge the problem beyond its just limitation nor try to readjust ourselves to other duties than those which have been assigned to us. Therefore, the thing we need just now is this self-consciousness as a Joint Commission, a Joint Commission self-consciousness, that is, of who we are. That is a primary thing we are called to. Secondly, I ask, What are our functions and what are our responsibilities? The Joint Commission is called to serve as an engineer, to discover and organize the dynamics of Methodism, not to reflect its past or present status. We are to serve as seers, as pioneers. Our functions are not to serve as historians. We are not to occupy ourselves with registering the past. This Commission, as I understand it, is called to see and interpret a vision, not to prepare an obituary, “sacred to the memory of.” We are called—I like that word: it is a good Methodist term—we are called to a specific work, a particular relation, with particular responsibilities. We are called to be a unit, or separate body, known as the Joint Commission, called by the Church, by its machinery individualized, each member of the Commission either through one General Conference or the other, by such processes as each has determined; we have been called out from the body of our peers, by the Church through its appointed agencies for this specific purpose, and I believe we must accept it as the call of God. I think he still has his hand on the affairs of men, especially the affairs of the Church; and while I do not believe the Church is infallible, I do recognize that God works in it and through it to accomplish his will. When I accepted my appointment, I accepted it as the call of the Church which chose me, but lying back of that in my consciousness was the belief that God

had called my brethren and me to serve on this Joint Commission, and called us to serve as what? Not as historians, not to interpret the past simply, but had called us as he called Isaiah, called us as he called those worthies of ancient times down through the ages, the worthies through whose vision prophecies were uttered. He called us as seers that we might see things that have been obscured in the dust of conflict and conquest, that we might see things that have been obscured in the haste of prejudiced prejudgments, that we might see things which were hidden from the backward-looking, that with uplifted faith, looking toward the azure of his purpose, we might be seers of the vision of his purpose and his glory, such a vision as comes to every one in moments of highest spiritual communion, and following his leading set up a new standard for the Church. We are called of God to the high function of seers, to see something which we never saw before, to think thoughts more comprehensive than we ever thought in the past. That does not mean that we shall fully understand all this. I do not think any of the prophets of old fully comprehended the significance of their utterances. God sent in times past, through these people, a message that is not yet outworn. Reason points a path in a certain direction; and when reason can go no further, faith lifts up its illuminating rays, and in its realizing light we walk on, not comprehending the full significance, but confident that it is the right. I believe God is calling us to be seers. Therefore, I think we have spent time enough in a downward look, and we have spent time enough on the backward look; and recognizing that as a Joint Commission we are called to the forward look, we should lift up our eyes and be responsive to all that God would reveal to us for the Church we represent. There are three elements entering into the progress for which we are to plan. God said to Abram, "Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it." "The Lord spake unto Joshua, saying, Arise, go over this Jordan, unto the land which I do give to the children of Israel. Every place that the sole of your foot shall tread upon, that have I given unto you." Jesus said unto his disciples, "Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields. He that reapeth receiveth wages; that both he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together." Vision is a law of Progress, occupancy is a law of Progress, and coöperation is a law of Progress. So, I take it we are called to vision, to occupancy, to coöperation with our Lord Jesus Christ, that we may recognize and reorganize the potentialities of American Methodism, and to form a plan for progress, not for entrenchment, or for retrenchment, or for retreat. We are called upon to be seers, to be promi-

ets, to be preachers, to be evangelists of the new and larger ministries for American Methodism. I would rather, Mr. Chairman, far rather, be a party, if it pleased God, to formulating a plan which it may require eight or twenty years for the Church to grow up to, than to formulating a plan which the Church has already outgrown or which it is likely to outgrow before it really becomes effective. This is our obligation, our privilege, our function, and our responsibility, as the Joint Commission on the reorganization of American Methodism. May I read from the proceedings of the General Conference at Oklahoma?

The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, regards the unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Protestant Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, by the plan proposed by the Joint Commission on Federation, as feasible and desirable, and hereby declares itself in favor of the unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in accordance with this general plan of reorganization, and in favor of the unification of all or any Methodist bodies who accept this proposed plan after it has been accepted by the Methodist Episcopal Church. However, we recommend that the colored membership of the various Methodist bodies be formed into an independent organization, holding fraternal relations with the reorganized and unified Church.

They placed themselves positively on record that certain things were feasible and desirable, and made a recommendation differing from the plan proposed by the Joint Commission on Federation. It further provided that:

In elaborating and perfecting the tentative plan that has been proposed and in carrying forward such negotiations as have for their purpose, and may result in, the consummation of the proposed unification in accordance with the basic principles enunciated in the suggestions which were adopted by the Joint Commission and reported to the General Conferences, should the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1916 declare itself in favor of unification through the proposed plan of reorganization and should appoint a Commission on Unification, separate from the Federal Council of Methodism, the representatives of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, are hereby instructed and empowered to appoint a similar Commission that shall serve until the meeting of the next General Conference. The representatives of this Church in the Federal Council of Methodism, or such Commission on Unification as may be appointed, shall report to the next General Conference the full details of the plan of unification which may be agreed upon by the Federal Council of Methodism or the Joint Commission on Unification for its consideration and final determination.

And the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Saratoga took similar action. May I read it?

1. The Methodist Episcopal Church, in General Conference assembled, hails with joy the prospect of an early reunion with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

We believe that the united Church will have greatly increased power in its conflict with evil in all lands, that it will be able to lay more effective

emphasis on the fundamentals of Christianity, and that it will be more potent in developing the higher loyalty to the supremacy of our common Lord and Master Jesus Christ.

We believe that such a union will hasten the development of a truly world Church, which will make for the rapid advancement and final triumph of the kingdom of God in the world.

2. The Methodist Episcopal Church regards the unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the Methodist Protestant Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, by the plan proposed by the Joint Commission on Federation, as feasible and desirable, and hereby declares itself in favor of the unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, in accordance with this general plan of reorganization, with the following recommendations:

(a) That the General Conference be made the supreme legislative, executive, and judicial body of the Church under constitutional provisions and restrictions.

(b) That the number of Quadrennial Conferences as stated in the proposed plan be so increased as to provide more adequately for the needs of the reorganized Church, both at home and abroad.

(3) That the General Conference consist of a single house, made up of delegates elected by the Quadrennial or Annual Conferences, or both.

We also favor the unification of all or any Methodist bodies who accept this proposed plan after it has been accepted and perfected by both the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Episcopal Church.

(d) That, conforming to the suggestion of the Joint Commission on Federation, the colored membership of the reorganized Church be constituted into one or more Quadrennial or Jurisdictional Conferences.

So sincerely do we believe that the union of the two Episcopal Methodisms is the will of God and so earnestly and devoutly do we desire that these two Churches may be one, that we hereby authorize and instruct the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church to conduct the negotiations in a generous and brotherly spirit.

This Commission shall report to the next General Conference the full details of the plan of unification which may be agreed upon by the Joint Commission on Unification for its consideration and final determination.

Now, if I understand the situation, it is this: We are proposing to syndicate—I see no objection to that term; though it has been abused, it represents a very definite idea—and in this syndication the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, are doing just what any bodies proposing to syndicate would do. The bodies proposing to syndicate lay down on the table everything which they possess in a corporate way, and a new appraisement is had in which everything is appraised according to its relationship to the new organization. No matter what may have been the past history or efficiency, if it is not likely to further the interests of the new organization, it is appraised as a liability to be eliminated and everything which may prove helpful is considered as an asset of the new organization. In this way, I understand we come here together as an appraising committee to determine what should enter into the new organization so as to increase its efficiency for the present and better adjust it to the conditions of the future.

One brings 7,440 preachers and the other 20,524 preachers; the one has 2,102,065 members and the other has 4,131,327 members; the one has \$70,470,497 of church property, and the other has church property valued at \$253,821,205; the one has 17,232 church buildings, and the other 30,738 church buildings; the one has 5,418 parsonages, and the other has 14,872 parsonages. These are all laid on the table to become a common possession; each belongs to all, and all belongs to each. If it were necessary to make a demonstration of the sincerity of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this matter, let me say that they did not appoint their twenty-five Commissioners to conserve the rights or prerogatives of the Methodist Episcopal Church, nor to represent the Methodist Episcopal Church solely in the reorganization, but to serve as appraisers, as engineers to assist in finding a better path along which these Methodist Churches may be unified, each having put into the enterprise everything that it has, and then seeing to it that every asset be reorganized for efficiency. We are perfectly sincere in this desire. The Methodist Episcopal Church requested the appointment of the same number of Commissioners, twenty-five, by each Church to serve as a Joint Commission. Had we been jealous to perpetuate that which has been, we would have said, Let the Commissioners of the two Churches be chosen on the basis of their respective investments: to the one, one-third; to the other, two-thirds. But the dominating idea was the reorganization for efficiency into one organization, adjusted to the trend of the present and to the necessities of the future. Therefore we said, Let the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, select twenty-five Commissioners, and we will select the same number; let each one of your Commissioners have the same relation to the whole subject that each one of our Commissioners will have, and let these Commissioners serve not as two separate Commissions, but as one Joint Commission, each Commissioner to have identically the same authority and responsibilities, without bias or prejudice; and without being preoccupied with the past, let us agree upon a plan for reorganizing American Methodism. We are all Methodists. We are one in spirit, and in that Methodist reorganization, for which we are to plan, all the assets which God Almighty has given to American Methodism are to be reorganized for larger efficiency in the evangelization of the world. I grant there are some apparently difficult problems confronting us. But we are here to prepare a plan—not necessarily *the* plan, but a plan—which, in the serenity of our dependence upon the God of our fathers, interprets the largest vision we can compass for the reorganization of American Methodism. Thus far we have proceeded (for, thank God, there has been real progress)

—thus far we have proceeded on the assumption that the relation of the negro is a problem, and it is a problem. But it is a problem common to both Churches, both of us having negro members. We have more colored members than you, but it is not a question of quantity. If it is a problem at all, it is a qualitative problem, as sin is qualitative. I do not believe in quantitative forgiveness of sin. I do not believe God will forgive seventy-five per cent of one's sins and let him retain the other twenty-five per cent. I believe sin is qualitative; so I think this is a qualitative, and not a quantitative, problem. When the plan was proposed that there should be a separate organization of Colored Methodists within the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, they preferred an independent colored Church; but quite a number of the colored members said they would not go. That was their privilege. In 1890 there were about 700 of that class included in its membership, and there continue to this day about 200 of these members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, who are negroes. If a plan of segregation into an independent General Conference, or an Associate General Conference, or any other method should be agreed upon, would you force these 200 members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, to go into that organization, as it is proposed to force our 300,000 colored members to do? May I ask the further question, not intending to be offensive, but to get a basis of understanding? If this organization runs such a line of demarcation through the Churches, would you, in your Cuba Mission, exclude from fellowship in your Church everyone who had a trace of negro blood? Would you, in your Brazil Missions, run a line of demarcation through your membership, and exclude everyone who had any trace of negro blood from fellowship in your Church? Could you? There might be legal difficulties. It would be exceedingly embarrassing, for in Brazil, not including the Indians, about twenty-five per cent are whites, twenty-five per cent blacks, and about fifty per cent "betweenians." You would not attempt to do anything so radical as that in Brazil. I have heard members of your Church say that there have been persons received from those areas into your leading white schools in the South who had negro blood. I have been told that there have been members in your General Conference whose blood was not absolutely untainted. Therefore, I want to know if the line of demarcation proposed is to be equally active over the whole area, and not over one Church, but only in the other when we come together? But there is a larger problem than this. It is not the problem of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and it is not the problem of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, only. There is a peculiarity about the problem which strikes me with great force—

namely, that there is nothing in the organic law of the Methodist Episcopal Church, or of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, which makes the slightest suggestion of legal discrimination against any member of either Church. They are recognized as members, whatever their color, whatever their language, whatever their nationality. If they are members of either Church, they are members upon the same legal basis. Therefore, to a limited extent, the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, are alike in that we both have negro members, and as such they cannot be legislated out of the Church. They have inherent rights which they can defend in courts of law. They cannot be limited in their privileges by legislation. Therefore, it is a mutual problem; and if it were entered into completely, we would have to face the same situation. They are not all in either area. In this, the problem of the Churches is similar. We are here primarily to legislate for the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in seeking to form a plan, which may become a part of the Constitution for the reorganized Church, we should recognize that the Constitution may not have written into it any special legislation either for or against any class or condition, no discrimination except such as is based upon those things which are removable by the parties themselves. You may say that there is discrimination now, based upon language, race, nationality. There are separate churches, Quarterly Conferences, Annual Conferences. Yes, that is true. Then, why not in the General Conference? I have two legs and two arms, and I have one head, and in that head I have a brain with two segments working together, so related that the segment in the right side includes the centers of motor activities for the left side of the body, and the reverse, but there is only one head. I would not desire to be in the position of having two heads and only one leg. I would not desire to be in the position of having two heads and only one arm. I would not desire to be in the position of having only one finger. There is a natural line of demarcation. Why the negro in the General Conference? I am not arguing the question of the negro in the General Conference. I am trying to bring to the consciousness of this Joint Commission its responsibility before God to put itself upon the "whomsoever" platform of Jesus Christ our Lord, who by the grace of God tasted death for every man. He said to his disciples, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." You may say that is not seriously interfered with by one or two Conferences. I have not been able to see up to the present time that this problem is simplified in the least by the action proposed. There is no inherent, legal objection to a negro in your chief Church gov-

ernmental organization. It was only through the grace of one of your colored members refusing the election, I have been informed, that your General Conference to meet in May next at Atlanta will not have a colored delegate in it. There is nothing in your general rules to prevent it, and you have conditions which, sooner or later, will naturally find expression in this result. It is morally certain, I have been told, that you will have a colored delegate in your General Conference four years hence from your Mission in Africa, possibly from your Mission in Cuba, probably from your Mission in Brazil; and if you are looking forward to that as a possibility, or as a probability, and without any legal resistance or prohibition, the percentage will be almost as large in your General Conference with three or four hundred delegates, as is proposed in the plan before us for the Joint General Conference. It has not proven to be inherently bad for the Presbyterian General Assembly. When it met recently at Dallas, Tex., it had thirty-six delegates, and there was not a ripple of protest or excitement. It did not create even a question in the daily papers, I have been told. They have a million and a half members, and we shall have as a minimum 6,000,000. That would make us about four times as large, and they had two and a quarter times as many delegates as is proposed here; so proportionately that would be about ten times the representation proposed for the reorganized Church. You say that is a Northern Church. The Southern Presbyterian General Assembly held in Atlanta had colored delegates; and what is more, the General Assembly received into its organization the largest independent Presbytery in the South, a colored Presbytery, and I have heard it said by men who have the reputation of being their leaders that they propose to follow that process and take all they can into their organization. Therefore, it is not inherently bad. In the Episcopal General Convention they have colored representation, and they have had two negro bishops. These evangelical Churches, working in the same area in which reorganized Methodism will work, have faced this problem in its relation to the kingdom of Christ, and they find the color line is no serious hindrance. I do not say, I do not mean to intimate that you have a particle less loyalty to the colored man than we have. I do not say that you love him less than the Methodist Episcopal Church. There is a difference, however. May I show this difference as I understand it, in psychology and practice of love? There is a communistic love and an individualistic love, and the Methodist Episcopal Church loves the negro communistically, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, loves the negro individualistically. You love your old mammy and the boys you played with for them-

selves individually. You will find a stronger aversion in the North to that individual love than you will in the South. I am also sure that you will find a larger sympathy with the negro in the North communistically than individualistically. A colored man was sailing on a boat that put into Boston some few years ago, and he was told that the boat was going to leave with a return cargo at a certain time. While he was out in the city, they finished loading and sailed an hour or two before the hour announced. When he returned to the dock, the ship had gone, and he was a penniless stranded stranger. He foraged around to get something to eat, and failed to find anything for a couple of days. He begged here and he begged there, but got nothing, and finally found himself in the West End among the mansions of the wealthy. There was a gentleman from the South living there who had gone to Boston, entered into the practice of law, and been eminently successful. The negro walked up to the front door of the Southerner's house, without knowing who lived there, and rang the bell, just as the gentleman of the house was coming out on his way to business. When he saw the colored man, he said: "You nigger, what are you doing here?" The negro said: "I come up from the South on a boat and they went away without me. I have no way to get back, and I ain't had nothin' to eat for two days." The Southerner said: "Don't you know better than to ring a gentleman's front door-bell? Go around to the back door, and they'll give you all the food you need." And the negro said: "Thank the Lord, boss, I have been here three days and this is the first time I have found a gentleman yet." There was individualistic appreciation. No matter what the manner of expression, he understood it. It seemed like home, because he knew that in and through and dominating his manner was the personal interest to see that he should not starve. There is a difference in the love. Let me say further that this method of segregation has not been a success. So far, this method has come on the initiative of the colored man every time. In 1816 the African Methodist Episcopal Church was organized in New York. They asked the Methodist Episcopal Church to send them a bishop to organize them and preside over them, and they adopted practically the old Discipline, but they wanted to be separate from the white folks. In 1820 the same thing occurred in Philadelphia, and the Colored Methodist Episcopal Zion Church went off through the initiative of colored men. In 1870 our brethren of the Church, South, did not wish the colored members to go off into an independent Church, but to organize an associated or coördinated Church; but nearly all the negroes preferred an independent Church and the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church was or-

ganized. That is the genius of the colored man at the present stage of his intellectual and ecclesiastical development. It has been differentiation to the present time. But, please God, the time is coming when they will prefer and seek efficiency through coördination, and all colored Methodists, no doubt, become organically one in a great Church closely federated with universal Methodism. A party was visiting one of the great insane asylums, and because the man was one of much distinction the Director himself was showing him around. When they came to a gallery overlooking the ward where most of the desperate cases were confined, the turnkey had just unlocked the cells and the desperate cases came out into the open space of the ward for exercise. The visitor said, "Is it not dangerous to let your worst cases mingle together?" "No," said the Director; and just then two of the insane got into a fist fight. Several of the inmates stood around and looked on, as did the keepers. The visitor said, "Suppose the inmates should join together and all jump on the wardens, couldn't they overpower them?" "But," said the Director, "if they had sense enough to get together, they would not be fit inmates for this place." Their coördinating faculties were not equal to recognizing the possibility of unity, or realizing it in action. I am morally certain that much of the accentuated difficulties of the colored question, as they exist to-day, root back in the carpetbagger days of reconstruction. But while that was a horrible crime, the evils of which still persist, a considerable part of the difficulty inheres in the spirit of the segregated organizations of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, and in a degree of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, because the first two are antagonistic to and misunderstand the whites, are suspicious of them, and they have not had the opportunity for correcting their attitude through contact and fellowship. When the period of reconstruction was active, had there been statesmanship, and its concomitant unselfishness, had the Commissioners of Reconstruction been largely wise Southern men who knew the negro and sympathized with his problems, most of the difficulty could have been avoided. But they were gotten off to themselves, organized for any purpose that suited the organizers, and under such conditions as furnished slight chance for improved relations. Segregation has not demonstrated the advisability of that method of procedure. But I am morally certain if we could organize so as to have Sub-regional Conferences of our colored folks, have them come in contact with their friends, participate in discussions, and become informed as to their ideals and motives, they would have a wider outlook and higher ideals, and it would not be long before there

would be a drawing together. By the excellence of their improved Church life and enlarged prospects, they would contribute to the development of a great Colored Methodist Church. I cannot conceive of it being brought about in any other way. Legislation cannot do it. They are living in the past and not the present. I believe that would be the result, but that is my own best judgment. I believe each of the Subregional or Missionary areas should have representation in the General Conference, because the General Conference represents universal Methodism: First, to show that it is a universal Church. Second, as the General Conference has exclusive right to legislate for all connectional purposes, all fields should be represented for information, and as a part of the General Conference, exercising their rights and privileges as Methodists. Third, for the illumination which would come to their minds from the discussions as to motives and purposes of the actions taken. Fourth, let it be known that every action was based upon a sincere purpose to advance the kingdom of which they are an integral part. Fifth, to be in preparation for the larger responsibilities which will come to them when they must assume larger leadership in their Church areas. Through the Regional Conferences and the Subregional Conferences there is a great opportunity for development. I am unwilling to speak about the development of race consciousness. I do not like the phrase. It is something contrary to good Methodist doctrine. God created all men with the same blood, and God has given to each a different environment; but in spite of race peculiarities, which are inevitable and which may be in a measure antagonistic, he is bringing all men, as his sons, into higher relations of coöperation. Therefore, respecting them as I desire to be respected, I think there should be a proper representation in the General Conference of all American Methodist organizations throughout the world, as included in the Regional and Subregional Conferences. Let me say one thing further. I am looking upon this discussion with great hope. I believe we are getting just where the Lord wants us to be. He has not given me any brief to speak for him, except he has given me a brief to say that it must be upon the "whosoever" basis which he always insisted upon. Our action must not be narrowed to a particular class when it is of universal application. It is possible, I believe, for us to come together. If I mistake not, we can agree upon everything, with perhaps one exception, and I am not certain that we may not agree upon that. We have agreed tentatively upon everything except that relation of the negro to the reorganized Church. There is no reason for discouragement if we do not agree upon that. It is our privilege to make a majority report and a mi-

nority report; or, better than that, to present alternate reports, setting forth the divergent views. In that case, we will have done great service. We have scanned the horizon, organized the dynamics, agreed with practical unanimity upon all but one point, and that we refer to the General Conferences to settle. If they should differ, they can do as Congress does: when the two Houses disagree, they appoint a Committee of Reference to find a way to proceed. What is in my mind is this: We should proceed with our work, we should agree upon everything we can agree upon; and concerning that which we may not agree upon, we send in alternate propositions, and simply say we submit these recommendations which we have not been able to harmonize. I trust we shall proceed with the completion of the plan, which is of necessity a tentative plan, and I would spread it broadcast throughout the Church that there should be no guessing, no garbled report, no uncertainty concerning our action, and that it may be discussed by those whom we desire to represent; and when we adjourn, that we shall adjourn to meet sometime in the month of April, keeping our committees in existence, appointing others, if need be, for editorial and publication service, and instruct them to keep tab on everything that comes out in the papers in the way of discussion of the plan pro and con, every suggestion that comes to modify, amplify, and eliminate; and let us come together in the early part of April, and then formulate our final report to be presented to the two General Conferences in conformity with our instructions, to formulate a plan to be submitted for final determination by the lawmaking powers of the Church. Such a discussion would be illuminating, and I believe such a procedure would be morally certain to register itself in results, which I believe would result in unification.

Henry Wade Rogers: I rise to a question of privilege, really two questions of privilege. The first is this: I am obliged to leave this afternoon. I desire to leave my vote as Bishop Wilson left his with the other Commission, although I do not propose to leave mine with the same Commissioners.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): You might well trust them.

Henry Wade Rogers: Will you give me that permission?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Is there objection?

P. D. Maddin: I move that it be granted.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Henry Wade Rogers: Then, without having consulted the brethren I name—I hope they will not refuse—I would like to leave my vote with Bishop Cranston, Dr. Goucher, and Dr. Wallace.

Bishop McDowell: I move that these brethren be permitted to qualify as executors of Brother Rogers without bond.

Henry Wade Rogers: I desire to present, with your permission, from the Subcommittee a supplemental report to be considered with the other report already in your hands. The intention was that at this time there should be mimeograph copies enough to place in the hands of each member of the Commission. That was arranged for so far as we are concerned, but the copies have not yet been received, although they will be here some time during the day, so that a copy of this paper will be in the hands of each member of this Commission. If you will allow me to read it, I should like to do so and then say just a few words in reference to it. In submitting it I wish to say, although it is hardly necessary that I should say it, that if I regarded it in any way as unrighteous or as working any injustice or wrong it would not have my support; but for the reasons which I shall give after I have read the paper I do not think it is unrighteous or unjust or wrong in any way. It is presented not with a "may" but with a "shall," and before it is rejected by either Commission I ask them to consider it in all its details and be very careful that in their ultimate action they are not governed by prejudice instead of reason. After reading this paper I desire to make a few comments with reference to it, but my comments shall be brief.

Bishop Atkins: Is this paper based on the Preferential Report?

Henry Wade Rogers: It is. This is different from the other report in that it provides for Associate General Conferences. That report dealt with the power of Subregional Conferences and deprived their members, as the present Constitution deprives all the members of Missionary Conferences, of the right to vote; but if we create an Associate General Conference for them they should have the right to vote on constitutional questions. I have incorporated this in the proposal now submitted.

The Supplemental Report of Judge Rogers was then read, as follows:

SECTION FIVE.

1. When any (Subregional, Central, or Associate) Conference attains a membership of 600,000, its right to representation in the General Conference shall terminate, except as hereinafter provided; and it shall establish, unless by constitutional process it is otherwise ordered, an Associate General Conference, which shall have complete legislative, judicial, and executive powers in the ecclesiastical government of its membership in harmony with and subject to the constitution of the Church, together with the power to elect bishops, constitute its boards, elect its general administrative officers, vote on constitutional questions, share proportionately in the proceeds of the Book Concern, and have title and possession of their houses of worship and parsonages.

I have stopped where I have, because, as I understand it, the schools, colleges, orphanages, and hospitals are held for the negroes by the Freedmen's Aid Society and would continue to be so held.

2. And any (Subregional, Central, or Associate) Conference having a membership of less than 600,000 may, if it so desires, apply to the General Conference for authority to establish an Associate General Conference, and when so requested, the General Conference shall authorize such an Associate General Conference to be established with the powers as provided in the paragraph preceding, and when so established the right of the (Subregional, Central, or Associate) Conference making such application to representation in the General Conference shall cease, except as provided in the succeeding paragraph.

3. An Associate General Conference shall be entitled to representation in the General Conference by five ministerial and five lay delegates, who shall be elected by it and shall act as an Advisory Commission to the General Conference, having the right to speak either in the General Conference or its standing committees on all matters which relate to and affect the interests of the Associate General Conference from which they come, but without the right to vote.

The reason why we provide "without the right to vote" is because these members will have the right to vote in their own General Conference; and having the right to vote there it seemed hardly the thing to provide that they should have the right to vote in our General Conference. Now, if you will allow me a few words, I desire to call attention to the fact that the proposition now submitted, if adopted, will not deprive a single colored member of his membership in the Methodist Episcopal Church. I also call attention to the fact that by express provision it will not deprive him of any right of property. It does, however, take from him the right to sit and vote in the General Conference, except as he may sit there as a member of an Advisory Commission. I also say that there is nothing in the law of the land or in the ecclesiastical law which makes it illegal for us to adopt the proposition as proposed. If we make it a part of the Constitution of our united Church, no rights of property will be illegally divested. The State of New York adopted, the other day, an amendment to its Constitution. The Constitution of that State gave the right to vote to white male citizens. The amendment dropped the word "male." What followed? That a woman in New York may now vote not only for presidential electors but for a Senator of the United States and for a member of the House of Representatives; that she may vote for a Governor of the State, for members of the Legislature, and for all State officers. What else? That she may herself be elected a Presidential elector; that she may herself be elected to the Senate of the United States or to the House of Representatives; that she may herself be elected Governor of the

State or to the State Legislature, and even elected a Judge of the New York Court of Appeals. No one supposes that the fact that these rights have been conferred upon the women of New York by that amendment would prevent the State from repealing that amendment, thus withdrawing the rights granted. It could do it. When it adopted that amendment it did not affect any property rights. No woman in the State was worth a penny more or a penny less. Her property was just exactly what it was before; and if the State should now withdraw from her the right to sit in the Senate of the United States or in the House of Representatives or in the Legislature of the State, it will not affect her property rights in the least. Her rights of property would be just exactly what they were before the change took place. So here, so long as we do not deprive these brethren of their membership in our Church, or take from them their property rights, the Church can by a constitutional amendment withdraw from them their right to sit and vote in the General Conference. One thing more: What is the objection to taking away the right to sit in the General Conference and the right to vote in the General Conference? Somebody says that is wrong. He does not want to deprive the negro of any right which he has. Will you let me say in answer to that suggestion that I regard the proposition I have submitted as a Methodist proclamation of emancipation, a veritable Magna Charta? The negroes in our Church to-day do not rule themselves in Church matters. They cannot move hand or foot without our consent. They have some 80 members in a General Conference of over 800. They cannot do anything unless we consent. The plan proposed gives them their freedom full and complete and legislative control over all their affairs. Why say that we are depriving them of their rights? We are not. We are really emancipating them. We are in effect saying to them, You shall have complete control over your own affairs with the right to vote as you please. Suppose when Lincoln called his cabinet together and read the Emancipation Proclamation some members of the cabinet had said: "Now, Mr. Lincoln, you ought not to do this thing, because you are depriving these people of their rights." And if Mr. Lincoln had asked what rights, the answer would have been, "The rights which grew out of the fact of their dependence on their masters, the right to lodging and the right to clothing and the right to food, and the right to medical attendance." The blacks had those rights and that Emancipation Proclamation took those rights away from them and it was only justified because of the greater rights that the Emancipation Proclamation conferred upon them by making them free. Mr. Lincoln took from them their minor rights that he might give them their major rights. Now, one

thing more. Suppose some member of the Cabinet had said, "Now, Mr. Lincoln, you ought not to deprive these people of any of their rights, without letting them vote on the proposition!" Why, there are negroes who would have voted to remain in a state of slavery. Some years ago I was in the State of Mississippi and I went down to Natchez, among other places, and while I was there I was taken to the home of Judge Boyd, who was a member of the Supreme Court of Mississippi before the war. There was an old mammy there who had been a slave in that family for years. I remember well talking with her. I asked her, "Do you prefer the present system or the old system—do you prefer freedom or slavery?" I remember well what she said. "So far as I am concerned," she said, "I would prefer slavery, because in those days I never had to think about my clothes and I never had to think about my lodging or about my food. To-day I have to look after all these things." So, I say, somebody might say you ought to submit this to the negroes and let them vote on it. Would it not have been absurd for Mr. Lincoln if he had acted on any such suggestion? and, I repeat, the justification for what he did was that he was giving them full and complete liberty and they were surrendering minor rights. If we adopt this provision, we are cutting them off from the right to vote in the General Conference, but what are we giving them? Absolute freedom over all their own affairs. They may elect their own bishops. They may pass all legislation which affects them in any way, whereas to-day they cannot pass anything in fact that we do not agree to. That is not freedom. Therefore, I say, do not turn down the proposition now submitted without giving it careful consideration and asking yourselves the question whether we are doing them a wrong to deprive them of the minor right of sitting and voting in the General Conference while we give them the larger right to do as they please. I again venture to remind you that simply by withdrawing the privilege of suffrage you are not interfering in the slightest degree with any right of property and you are not violating any law of the land. The proposition is consistent with the constitutions of the States and with the Constitution of the United States, and I say it is a proclamation of absolute freedom for the colored race, and as such I hope we shall all of us accept it and come to an agreement on it, North and South. Does some one say that the plan proposed is based on race distinctions? So it is, but I do not know that that constitutes an objection. We have in our Church now race distinction in that we have white Conferences and colored Conferences, white Churches and colored Churches, white General Superintendents with no General Superintendents of color. Is it illogical to have a colored Associate

General Conference in view of the fact that we have colored Annual Conferences? I am unable to see any sufficient reason for objecting to an Associate General Conference for men of African descent when we propose that there shall be one for men of Chinese descent and another for the men of India and another for the men of Latin America. There is nothing proposed which is unrighteous or unfair or in any way improper. Let us now rid ourselves of our false and erroneous ideas, put aside all the differences which have kept us apart for seventy-five years, and make these Churches one, completing the work we were sent here to accomplish.

E. C. Reeves: You tell us that is the report of a subcommittee. I do not know who composed that subcommittee and I would love to know, and I would love to know whether it is unanimous; and I think as important a paper as that is should have the signatures of those who propose it appended to it, and if any part of the Commission joins in it will they not stand up and say so before our people and let us have a look at them? I think the time is ripe for us to have some such expression.

John M. Moore: If I may be allowed—

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I have just recognized Dr. Blake, but I understand that this is a question that pertains to that paper.

John M. Moore: It relates to the members of that subcommittee.

Bishop Cranston: Are questions of this kind in order as to the source of a report which has been presented and explained?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I think any member of the Commission has a right to know not only the source, but by what authority a paper comes before the Commission, and I will recognize Dr. Moore to ask Judge Rogers a question.

John M. Moore: I want to answer Judge Reeves's question. He wanted to know if any member of our Commission had anything to do with that supplemental report.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Without objection Dr. Moore can proceed.

John M. Moore: The report on the Status of the Negro came from the Committee on the Negro, not as a report of the Committee but as a report of the Subcommittee on the Status of the Negro, made up of Judge Rogers, Dr. Wallace, Dr. Snyder, and myself. The Committee on the Status of the Negro simply presented that report to this Commission without recommendation. This paper came up in the same way. The Committee came together and this Subcommittee was allowed to present this paper as an amendment to the report which they had submitted hitherto.

E. C. Reeves: I have what I wanted.

Bishop McDowell: May I ask a question of Dr. Moore?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): This is all done by unanimous consent because Dr. Blake has been recognized.

Bishop McDowell: Is this in the nature of an amendment to the report already sent in or is it a supplement?

John M. Moore: It is a supplement to Section 5.

Bishop McDowell: Is it presented just as the rest, without recommendation?

John M. Moore: Yes, sir.

P. D. Maddin: I would like to have the privilege of the floor. I advocated that report last night and I very cordially advocate it here now.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: A question of privilege. I should like the same privilege accorded me that you accorded a little while ago to Judge Rogers. I would like to be excused after to-day from further attendance on the sessions of this Commission, and I would like to leave my vote in the hands of certain of my brethren.

John F. Goucher: I do not want to pry into Brother Van Cleve's private matters, but we adjourned at Traverse City, not because we didn't have a majority—there were a little more than two-thirds—but it was thought eminently necessary that any report that went out from this Joint Commission should not go from the remaining or a part of the Committee; and with the concurrence of a large majority of the full Committee we adjourned out of respect to those who said they had to go away because of previous arrangements. Notice was given there that we should meet here for at least two weeks, so that the report would not go down to the Church with certain persons absent, but might have consideration of the full Commission. We understand that Judge Rogers has to leave because of official responsibility that he cannot control. I know not what is in the mind of Dr. Van Cleve. I am not going to make fish of one and fowl of the other, and if there is any engagement that he could not control, all right; but we should not establish a precedent, because we will find ourselves before we get through in the same condition we were in Traverse City, many of the busy men being compelled to absent themselves. But we came here with the understanding that we were to stay here two weeks and we want to have every one here that we can and I object unless there is compulsion.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: The reason I ask this is that I am compelled to be in Chicago to testify in a civil suit involving a great deal of money to the Methodist Episcopal Church there,

and my presence there is imperative and I have waited until the last minute. I am compelled to go now.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Is there any objection to this request being granted? The Chair hears none and it is so granted. Only by unanimous consent is that in order. I emphasize that because I desire to preside with propriety, Bishop McDowell.

Bishop McDowell: With reference to that request for leave of absence, if there is unanimous consent given, Dr. Van Cleve, in the event of being obliged to retire, will be able to leave a reserve delegate present in the person of Dr. Stuart.

John F. Goucher: I withdraw my motion.

Bishop McDowell: It is not, therefore, the same as the case of Judge Rogers. We have exhausted our list of reserve lay delegates, but in the case of ministerial members Dr. Stuart is present.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: Then I do not need to leave my vote with anybody. I know it will be very well taken care of.

E. C. Reeves: I want to give notice right now that I am going to object to anybody's leaving any votes for anybody else to cast hereafter. It is wrong.

Bishop McDowell: I should like it to be clearly understood that those who are to speak hereafter, since the introduction of this supplemental report, shall feel, as all who have heretofore spoken have felt, free to speak on the whole subject and not feel that they are obliged to limit their remarks to this supplemental report.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): No motion being before us, the former motion prevails as to the whole matter.

On motion of Rev. H. M. Du Bose, duly seconded and put to a vote, the time was extended until Dr. Blake finished his remarks.

Edgar Blake: The subject that is now before us was discussed for two entire sessions at Baltimore. It was discussed incidentally at Traverse City and it is now the fifth day of the discussion in this meeting. Thus far I have not spoken on this subject in any of the three sessions of the Commission. Indeed, I have had no desire to discuss it, and I would not speak now if it were not that a sense of duty is upon me to do so. In view of all that has transpired within and without the Commission I would not like to have these proceedings appear in printed form without having put myself upon record on this matter here. And it is for this reason that I rise to address myself to the subject. And, may I be permitted in the very beginning to correct a misstatement, unintentionally made, on the floor yesterday? It was said in substance yesterday by one of the Commissioners of

our Church that a certain brother who was in the service of the Board of Sunday Schools, with which Board I am officially connected, wrote an article on this subject for *Zion's Herald*, and that the Board of Sunday Schools was obliged to dismiss him from its service because he by his article became *persona non grata* to the colored members of our Church. The facts in the case are these: The brother in question was notified that his services would not be continued with the Board of Sunday Schools beyond the close of the current year, and this notification was given him long before he ever wrote his article. I wish to make that perfectly clear.

Bishop McDowell: Will Dr. Blake allow me, as a former President of the Board of Sunday Schools, to confirm the statement he has just made as to the notification of this particular member that his services would have to be terminated?

Edgar Blake: Thank you, Bishop. Coming to the consideration of this subject, I was greatly impressed with the statement of my friend, Mr. Simpson, of Philadelphia, concerning his preparation for the work of the Joint Commission. You will recall that he stated that he went to the New Testament and read it through three times in order that he might arrive at the mind of the Master on this subject. I did not do that—not, however, from any feeling that I did not desire to know the mind of the Master. For, as God is my judge, I have no desire in my heart except to know and to do the will of my Master. I pursued another course. When the Chattanooga agreement was first presented I was prejudiced against it, and in order to fit myself intelligently to discuss and oppose the plan I took the documents away with me for ten days that I might give them close study. But when I examined the documents and reflected upon them I became convinced that the plan was not only a wise one but the only one that afforded a satisfactory solution of the problem of the reorganization of the two Churches. After I had studied the plan, I proceeded to study the conditions that obtained in those sections where these two Churches are working side by side. My investigation revealed the following facts: The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, had, as I now recall, seven Annual Conferences organized in territory in which the membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church was in the majority, and the Methodist Episcopal Church had eight Conferences organized in distinctly Southern territory; the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, had nine Conferences and the Methodist Episcopal Church six Conferences in what we generally speak of as the border States. I also found from my investigation that more than forty per cent of the churches of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South,

in the Northern and Western territory were located in communities where the Methodist Episcopal Church was also at work. I found that thirty-four per cent of the churches of the Methodist Episcopal Church in far Southern territory were located in communities where the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was also doing work. In the border area, I found that twenty-seven per cent of the churches of our denomination were located in communities where the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was also working. My investigation showed that the two great denominations had approximately twelve million dollars invested in church properties located in the same communities competing with each other. I found that the two denominations were spending approximately seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars a year for the pastoral support of churches competing with each other in the same communities. In the light of these tremendously significant facts, and in the light of the present conditions in America and the world, I want to say to this Commission that the continuation of these conditions has no justification either at the bar of reason or before the bar of Almighty God, and I cannot understand the mental processes or the heart attitude of one who would willingly consent to a continuation of these conditions. We are not making haste in these matters. The plan that we are now considering has been before the two Churches since 1910, and for nearly fifty years the two Churches have been negotiating toward the end we are seeking here. Certainly we are not exceeding the speed limit in our consideration of the subject. I made another investigation. I clearly saw that the men who were to be most affected by the reunion of the two Churches were not the men of New England, nor the men of the middle West, but the men of the far South and in the border States, and I sent a communication to the pastors of our Churches in the Southern and border territory to get their mind on this matter. I received replies from seven hundred and twenty-one Methodist pastors in the border and Southern territory representing nineteen hundred and eighty-one Methodist Episcopal Churches, a pretty representative company as you will see, and out of those seven hundred and twenty-one ministers who replied to my inquiry, ninety per cent of them declared themselves in favor of reunion, six per cent declared themselves opposed, and four per cent were noncommittal. With that showing before me, and with the conditions to which I have called attention in mind, I thought that we were justified in doing our best to bring about the reunion of the two Methodisms. But the reorganization of the two Churches is not so simple a problem as it has appeared to be to some. In certain discussions to which I have listened outside of this body, and in some of

the discussions I have listened to here, there appear to be many who think that the work of reuniting the Churches is largely a problem like that of bringing together two bodies of water that were separated only by a dam.

Bishop Hamilton: How do you spell that word?

Edgar Blake: To the pure all things are vile. There are those who think that all that is necessary is simply to lift the gates and let the waters flow together and the thing is accomplished. I do not so regard it. The first thing we must do is exactly what Dr. Goucher did, take stock in order to discover what the elements are that we must reorganize. What are the elements that we have? If you turn to Eastern Asia, you will find there a hundred and ten thousand members and probationers. In Southern Asia we have another constituency quite distinct and entirely separate from those in Eastern Asia; in Europe you have a situation entirely different from either of those in Eastern or Southern Asia. In Latin America you have still another element quite different from those that I have mentioned; and in the United States you have two distinct elements in the Church here. You have the Afro-American and you have the white American, and they represent two distinct elements or problems that must be considered. As I see it, there are six different elements that must be considered in the reorganization, each separate and distinct in its character. To attempt to standardize all these different elements and force them into a common mold is to attempt an impossible thing. Rather we must provide a form of organization that will be as flexible in its frame and diverse in its form as the conditions to which we must minister. We must keep in mind that a form of government designed for the white constituency in the United States is not necessarily the best form of government for the Afro-American, neither is it necessarily the best for the Eastern Asiatic. What I am trying to point out is that we must deal with each constituency as its own conditions require. I do not regard the government of the United States as offering to us the best type to follow. You cannot build a world organization on a Federal system. While I would not press the matter too far, it seems to me that the organization of the British Empire is a vastly safer and more normal type for us to follow in our world Church. When you come to the British Empire you find that it is made up of widely differing elements and each element has a form of government suited to its needs. That is what we must come to in the Church. Coming to the negro question, there are two or three observations I want to make on that matter. In the first place, we have been discussing the negro here as the problem of the South. God knows it is a problem of the South; but I want to

say to the gentlemen of the Commission that it is becoming a very acute problem in the North, and the Northern Commissioners must face it, not only here but elsewhere. Let me call attention to this very interesting and significant fact—namely, that within one hundred thousand as many negroes have located north of Mason and Dixon's Line in the last eighteen months as located there during the entire two hundred and fifty years previous. Eight hundred thousand negroes have come North in the last eighteen months. Previous to 1910 only about nine hundred thousand were there. The three largest negro centers of America are now north of Mason and Dixon's Line. Between seventy-five and one hundred thousand negroes have come into Chicago within the last twelve months. We now have one hundred and sixty thousand negroes in that one city alone—and this is the appalling thing: that Chicago, with a hundred and sixty thousand negroes, has church accommodations for only eighteen thousand of them. It has appalled us when we have seen two hundred thousand immigrants from Russia or Austria coming to our shores in a single year; but, mark you, here is a migration of eight hundred thousand of a single race who have come into our midst in eighteen months' time, thirty per cent of whom are illiterate, and all of whom come with the ballot in their hands to participate in the government. Don't tell me that we do not face a critical situation in many of the Northern centers, for we do. What is the attitude of the North toward the negro? The *Chicago Tribune* says that in the North we say to the negro, "God bless you, good-by." One of the leading colored women of Chicago appeared before the Methodist Preachers' Meeting of that city and stated that it had been reported to her that the colored people in Chicago could not be waited upon in the largest dry goods store of the city. She said: "I did not believe it, therefore I went to investigate myself. I waited thirty minutes at one counter and could not get a clerk to wait upon me. I went to a floor manager and reported the case to him, but I received no satisfaction and no service. I went to the management and reported the case to one in authority and asked him this question: 'Is it true that the clerks of this establishment have been instructed not to wait upon colored people?' And he said: 'Madam, I do not know that any instructions of that character have been given, but I may as well say in perfect frankness that this establishment does not desire and would prefer not to have the trade of the colored people of Chicago.'"

R. E. Jones: Do you know the history behind that?

Edgar Blake: Yes, sir; I am simply pointing out the conditions that obtain. I know another case: I talked with one of our bishops recently. He had invited some friends in for Christ-

mas dinner. He said: "When we came down to breakfast we found that our cook had not come. We called up by phone and were told that she was ill and would not be able to come. There was a serious emergency. I went to the janitor, a colored man, and said, 'Do you suppose you could find a woman who would be willing to come in and cook our Christmas dinner?' The janitor said, 'I will see what I can do.' Then, not being willing to take a lone chance, I called up a German institution and asked if I could secure a cook for the day, and after a while I succeeded in getting one. I then sought the janitor and said, 'You need not get that cook for me.' The janitor replied, 'But, Bishop, she is on the way.' 'Very well,' I said; 'let her come. I have another, but we'll keep them both.' He said, 'Bishop, you can't do that here; a white woman will not work with a colored woman,' and she would not, and I had to send the colored woman away." I could give you instance after instance to show that a spirit of racial antagonism and ostracism is creeping into the North and is there to-day in a larger measure than most of you are aware. Our own Church has not been entirely guiltless in this matter; we have not been entirely free from blame. We have preached the doctrine of racial equality and then turned around and denied it in our practice. We have done a magnificent work for the negro, and, brethren of the South, I make no apology for what we have done for the negro in the Southland. I thank God for it, and I look upon it as the finest home missionary contribution that the Methodist Episcopal Church has made in America. We have done magnificent work for the negro, but it has been a work away from home. We have drawn the color line. We have our separate colored congregations and our separate Annual Conferences. We have separation all the way up to our General Conference. We have no mixed congregations in the North, except occasionally we find two or three persons of color in our congregations. Was it not stated on the floor of this Commission in Baltimore by a Northern member that he could visit the Annual Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and be graciously received, that he could also speak from their pulpits, but did he not also state that there was not a white Annual Conference or pulpit of his own Church in the South where he could be heard?

R. E. Jones: That is not a true quotation. I am the man quoted, and you are not quoting what I said. I know what I said.

Edgar Blake: I am quoting the substance of what was said at Baltimore.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Does Dr. Blake submit to your question?

Edgar Blake: Yes.

R. E. Jones: I do not like to interrupt the Doctor, but he is giving an entirely different impression from that the facts justify. I stated that I could visit the Conferences of the South, and I was showing that the negro in the Methodist Episcopal Church did not intrude himself upon the white people; and I said whenever I did visit a white Conference in the South we didn't go there because there were certain conditions that would make it appear that we were intruding. Did I not say that?

Edgar Blake: Yes, and more. Now that we are coming to the matter of representation in the General Conference, we might as well discuss the matter with frankness. What is the situation? We have ninety delegates, approximately, from our colored Annual Conferences in our General Conference. That is about the number, is it not?

John F. Goucher: Eighty-six.

Edgar Blake: Eighty-six. What is the actual situation? Is the negro on an equality with his white brethren? Theoretically he is, practically he is not. Let me cite a single case: In 1872 the colored Conferences petitioned the General Conference to elect a bishop of their own color, and the General Conference declared, "There is nothing in race or color that is a bar to an election to the episcopacy." Time and again the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church has taken that action, and in stronger terms. In 1896 it declared, "In the election of bishops there should be no discrimination on account of race or color, but men should be chosen because of their worth and fitness for the position. In the presence of this statement, often reiterated by various bodies of our Church, we believe the time has come when the General Conference may safely and wisely choose a bishop from among our seventeen hundred ministers of African descent." On the first ballot for bishops J. W. E. Bowen received 147 votes, C. C. McCabe 141, and Earl Cranston 115. On the second ballot C. C. McCabe received 218, J. W. E. Bowen 175, and Earl Cranston 164. Was Dr. Bowen elected? He was not. In 1904 the General Conference again declared that the time had come when a member of the African race should be elected to the episcopacy. But a bishop of African descent was not elected. As a comfort to the negro the General Conference proposed an amendment to the constitution providing for a Missionary Bishop of African descent. It was sent down to the Annual Conferences and defeated. In 1912 the amendment was again proposed and

again defeated. In spite of the fact that we have repeatedly declared for the equality of the negro we have denied him that equality when it has come to the higher offices of the Church. Even our good friend Bishop Hamilton, who stood on the floor and made that powerful appeal for the recognition of the negro, finally closed by saying that he would be willing that in episcopal matters the negro should be denied the privilege accorded white men.

Bishop Hamilton: I do not answer anything on the floor, but my time will come.

Edgar Blake: Yes, as mine has now.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Conversation between members on the floor is out of order.

Edgar Blake: Let me read from a recent article by one of our colored brethren, the Rev. J. W. E. Bowen:

While we are theoretically equal in all respects to every other race in the Church, we have the painful and humiliating experience that the facts are not upon closely speaking and friendly terms with theory. We are entitled to more than we have received. We do not contend for rights, but we are pleading for larger opportunities for racial development. We have asked for racial episcopacy, not to the exclusion of Saxon episcopacy, but for a larger, coöperation with the Saxon episcopacy, and for directing the forces among us. We have even consented to constitutional limitation of that episcopacy, lest we disturb the ungrounded fears of many in our Church that they would lose social preëminence were one lone black bishop placed in the position of leadership among his own people. Our pleas were laughed out of court, but we went on and are still going on, though limping somewhat. We asked for only one bishop, but so frightened and suspicious were some that this one black bishop might prove to be a wooden horse, or stronger than the whole board of twenty white bishops and the whole General Conference and the whole Church and wreck the Church, that this simple and rightful request was thrown out of the window.

I am calling attention to these things to say that the time has come when the Methodist Episcopal Church must do justice to our negro membership. We can no longer afford to preach one thing and practice another. And the thing that I am pleading for is that, however inferior you may regard the colored people, whatever may be the white superiority which we profess, the time has come when the Methodist Episcopal Church, and every other Church of Christ, must give the negro a fair and full chance to realize all that God has made possible for him to become. I am not asking for discrimination against the negro. I am calling attention to the injustices we have practiced in our own Church against him and which we are likely to perpetuate if we are not on guard. What are we going to do for the negro? My friend Dr. Harris made rather light of those who raised the question of what is best for the negro. Let me say for the benefit of the genial secretary that I have no

"dose of ipecac" for the negro hidden in this address. What are the propositions before us? We have the suggestion of an independent Church. I do not argue the question. I simply state the situation as I see it. The negroes are as much members of the Methodist Episcopal Church as any other part of our constituency and we cannot separate them into an independent Church without their consent. I may say further and with frankness that I do not believe it would be expedient for us to do so even if it were legal. The time has not come when we can wisely set aside our negro constituency into an independent body and turn over to them vast property interests without some supervisory check upon them. I do not believe that we can afford to separate the negroes from the white Church for our own sake. We need the negroes in the reorganized Church if we are to do our full duty by the colored race. If I do not misread the signs of the times, this racial problem that we have been discussing for five days is more vitally related to the future welfare and peace of America than any other question which we face. I want to say to you that the establishment of an independent Church for the negroes may not only create a race consciousness among them, but a race antipathy, and we cannot afford to encourage such antagonism. I hold, Mr. Chairman, that the Church that has in its membership a colored constituency through which it can function for the uplift of the colored race, as a whole, is the Church that will render the greatest service to America. A remarkable statement was made by Dr. Penn to the effect that forty per cent of the students of our Freedmen's Aid Schools come from outside of our own Church. If we come together, as I pray God we may, I hope we shall see the output of our schools for colored people quadrupled, for that will be one of the largest contributions that we shall make to the welfare of America. We cannot for our own sakes afford to turn the negro out of the Church. The second proposition: I assume that our negro Conferences will be put into a racial jurisdiction by themselves. The suggestion has been made that this racial jurisdiction be given the status of a Regional Conference on the same plane as the other Regional Conferences. We cannot do that under our present scheme, for we have provided that the delegates from the Annual Conferences of a Regional Jurisdiction shall constitute the Regional Conferences of that Jurisdiction, and we have provided that each Regional Jurisdiction shall have one lay and one ministerial delegate for each fourteen thousand members in full connection, provided that each Regional Jurisdiction shall have at least one hundred delegates in the General Conference. Under this provision the negro jurisdictions would elect, as I understand it, about

forty delegates. If we gave them full Regional representation or representation on a parity with the white Regional Jurisdictions, it would increase this number from forty to one hundred. The negroes themselves do not ask for anything like that. If we should not raise the number from forty to one hundred, we would not be willing, and I do not think the colored constituency would be quite willing, that forty delegates should elect a bishop for their race and control all their racial affairs. We come now to the suggestion in the preferential report that the colored constituency be given the status of a Missionary Jurisdiction, or Sub-regional Jurisdiction, or an Associate Jurisdiction—it does not matter what you call it, the thing is the same in either case—with a limited representation in the General Conference of ten, or it may be twenty or thirty, it does not matter for the purpose of my argument; you provide that they shall have limited representation, that they shall have anything to say on constitutional questions, and that the powers of this Associate Regional Conference shall be limited. You propose to put them into a subordinate relation. That is the proposition. Now, I have said again and again, on the platform and in the public press, that in view of the fact that the negro is a beneficiary group, a missionary status is the logical relation for his group. But, mark you, the thing we are discussing, or that I am trying to discuss, is not what is the logic of the case, but what is best for the negro. And here again I shall have to speak plainly. We have eighty-six negro delegates in our General Conference. He is theoretically on an equality there. I have served in four General Conferences and I speak with a knowledge of the situation when I say that our negro constituency gets little or no consideration in our General Conference. I have said in public what I say here, that the only time when the negro is considered is during the episcopal elections. Then his block of nearly ninety votes has been a haven of refuge for many an episcopal aspirant. What Dr. Harris said last night is quite justified by the facts—namely, that as a rule there is a white man in the woodpile every time. Now, if you put ten or twenty or thirty negroes into a General Conference made up of seven hundred white delegates, North and South, what show do you think the negro will get in such a General Conference? I will tell you: He will get mighty little. He will be pushed aside and will get no consideration and very little representation. I am afraid for the negro, not for the white man; we can take care of ourselves. It is the negro who will suffer. I am not giving you my own judgment alone. Let me quote the statement of J. W. E. Bowen in a recent article. Listen to this:

Long years of critical observation and study under the most favorable opportunities in the schoolroom, pulpit, and in wide travel from one end of the country to the other and in the most intimate and heart fellowship with this race, and by discriminating collection of data from this people, which has been carefully tested and sifted in the crucible of conservative wisdom, drive me to this irresistible conviction—namely, whatever policy is responsible for the unfulfilled pledges made to this people and for their ungratified hopes and just expectations, if persisted in, must eventually lead to the utter breakdown of faith, the weakening of their loyalty, the paralyzing of their energies, and a final decimation of their ranks, or produce a growth at such a “poor dying rate” as will destroy their own self-respect and make them the laughingstock of the Church.

If you put the negro into a missionary relation to the General Conference and label him a sub, you will perpetuate his present subordinate relation. You cannot escape that; and I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that no race in America, or anywhere else, can ever come to its best as a ward of another race. What you propose is to label him and keep him as a ward by this proposition. It may be the best thing we can do under the circumstances; but, as I see it, it is not a just thing nor the best thing for the negro. What does the negro want? I do not know. I think I know what he ought to have, and again I would like to quote my friend Dr. Bowen. It is a negro speaking:

If the Church would organize her negro membership into a jurisdictional or regional or quadrennial or central, or some such autonomous jurisdiction, or department, but not separated from the Church, that would give us the power of initiative, more local self-control in Church and school matters, and power to elect our own officers, subject to confirmation by the General Conference, under one constitution, and would at the same time keep us close to her heart, such an action would send a thrill throughout the negro membership and inspire them to such heroic endeavors to prove their worthiness as cannot be imagined by our greatest enthusiasts for the negro leadership.

The time has come for us to work out a relation for the negro that will give him a full and fair chance to work out his own racial salvation, without limitation and without any undue domination of his white brethren. That is what I am asking for. I do not want the negro to leave the Church. We cannot afford to have him leave, for the nation's sake. I want to give him his chance in the Church. I suggest that we create one Church, with one constitution to be the fundamental law of the entire connection, and that we create two jurisdictions for the present, one Afro-American, to include the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in America and Africa of colored people and another jurisdiction made up of the remainder of the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions of the two Churches; each jurisdiction to have its own General Conference, each General Conference under the limita-

tions and restrictions of the constitution to be supreme in the affairs of its own jurisdiction without interference from the other. Create one Judicial Council that shall be the final authority for the entire connection on constitutional questions, each jurisdiction to have proportionate representation on the Judicial Council. Create one set of administrative boards to care for the missionary, benevolent, educational, and publishing work of the entire Church. Give each jurisdiction proportionate representation on these boards. Have one board of bishops that shall meet from time to time for conferences on distinctly connectional matters, in which the bishops of both jurisdictions shall meet together. What have you done? I will tell you, you have lifted the negro to a place of parity alongside his white brethren. You have established such relations that they cannot unduly dominate him and he cannot unduly interfere with them. That is what I am trying to point out. You have at last given the negro a white man's chance. You say this discriminates against the negro; I say, Yes, it does; but, please God, it does discriminate in the wrong direction. It discriminates in the negro's favor and places him alongside his white brethren to work out with their help his racial destiny. You ask, Where do you get your union in such a proposition? You find the basis of your union in your constitution, your fundamental law. You find the expression of that union in your connectional boards and in your episcopacy. This plan takes care of the negro, and it does not label him as a sub. It labels him as a man with a man's chance to work out his own salvation on his own initiative, with the help of his white brethren. Don't tell me that I am preaching the doctrine of a white man's Church, for I am not and I never have. Don't tell me that this is "Anglo-Saxon arrogance." My father left my mother with three children to come into this Southland, as he thought, to liberate the negro, and his son has not become an enemy to the race which his father tried to serve. It is not simply the negro that we must consider. Eastern Asia, Southern Asia, and Europe are, or soon will be, in a position where they will be entitled to have more than a sub relation in the Church, and you will have to do more than give them a regional status. The time is coming when we shall have to give those jurisdictions across the seas complete autonomy in their own affairs, and we are establishing a precedent with the negro that will serve us in that day. As I see it, an Associate General Conference is the ultimate solution, not only for the negro, but for the foreign jurisdictions as well. We must eventually come to it. I will point out this other thing: A working provision of a council will have to be made for the creation and establishment of a

council of some kind in which the representatives of the various units may come together to decide those matters that concern them all. Will you suffer another word, for I have already made this statement more lengthy than I intended? I do not expect to have my way here. No man will have his way entirely; but though I do not have my way, and though you do not have your way, a way ought to be found, and a way, please God, will be found, I believe. Let me state the situation as I see it. Your General Conference of the South has recommended an independent Church for the negro. Ours has recommended a Regional Jurisdiction on a parity with the white jurisdictions. I do not think we can adopt either of these recommendations. I believe we must compromise. I have no suggestion to make, except this, that we do not leave Savannah until we have done our level best to effect a combination of these two suggestions or have brought out of them something else to submit to our Churches.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): We have reached the adjourning hour. The motion was to extend the time until the completion of Dr. Blake's remarks.

Bishop Atkins: I move that the paper presented by Judge Rogers and the speech of Dr. Blake be put in typewritten form as early as possible so that the members can each have a copy. We have reached the point in the consideration of this question at which hope begins to dawn and we need the papers for careful study.

The motion was seconded.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): You have heard the motion that the paper submitted by Judge Rogers and the address delivered by Dr. Blake be put in mimeograph form or published form of some kind for the use of the Commission. Are you ready for the question?

Bishop Atkins: I mean the plan given by Dr. Blake instead of the whole of his address. What I aimed at was really the plan.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I would like to ask a question of Dr. Blake if I may.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That will have to be postponed.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I think it would save time if I could ask Dr. Blake now.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): If there is no objection, it can be done now.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I want to know something about those letters that he wrote and the answers that he received.

Edgar Blake: I said I sent a number of communications to our pastors in the border and Southern States and received seven hundred and twenty-one answers, of which ninety per cent voted for union with the Church, South.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: In order that we may have a full understanding of the situation I would like to have Dr. Blake tell us how many communications he sent.

Edgar Blake: To all the members of the Annual Conferences in the border and Southern States, some fifteen hundred, as I recall; and I received answers, I think, from seven hundred and twenty-one.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: That answers the question.

The hymn, "Jesus, the very thought of Thee," was sung and the session was closed with the benediction by Bishop Denny.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Collins Denny.

The hymn, "Jesus, Lover of My Soul," was sung.

Mr. Alex. Simpson, Jr., conducted the devotional exercises and read Psalm xix.

Prayer was offered by Rev. John M. Moore and also by Mr. J. R. Pepper.

There was responsive reading of the twenty-third Psalm.

The roll was called and the following were present: Bishops Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. B. Murrah, W. A. Candler, James Atkins, Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Ministers: F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar, Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. W. Van Cleve, J. J. Wallace. Laymen: M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White, G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, H. W. Rogers, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock; Rev. C. M. Stuart, reserve.

The minutes of the morning session were read and approved.

Bishop William F. McDowell took the chair as presiding officer.

Bishop Hamilton: I am very sorry again to have to rise to a question of personal privilege in reply to some statements made by Dr. Blake. I am sorry that all the members of this Com-

mission are not present. I am opposed to nepotism anywhere as it is usually practiced, and certainly to the use of my brother in this Commission; the only force that could attach to his testimony as quoted by Dr. Blake is in the fact that he is my brother. I know there is prejudice in some Churches in the North as well as in the South. In order to have you understand, let me say that half a story is only good for nothing until the other half is told. It is now more than thirty years—I do not know that it is not nearer thirty-five, but it certainly is nearer thirty years than twenty years that my brother was pastor of the Church in Providence, R. I., to which reference was made. There is another brother, unless there is further designation that might be implicated in this matter, who happens to be on the sea at this moment on his way to Porto Rico as the Bishop of the Church, appointed to preside in that Mission; but I suppose my brother that was referred to was my only other brother who was ever pastor of the Church in Providence. What were the facts at that time? Two churches had been combined in that city, making one of the largest and, in a sense, the most self-assertive and self-controlled societies in that Conference. My brother as a stranger was transferred from another Conference to be pastor of that Church. I must have you understand that, owing to his youth, the fact of so important a Church and the conditions that I am bound to say obtained frequently in the North as well as in the South, this case does not have any present-time bearing in this debate, even though Brother Blake mirthfully would have you make much of the coincidence that he happens to be my brother. The second thing which I desire to be heard on as a matter of privilege is the reference to the statement I made at the close of the address, that I would favor the election of a colored bishop, with such restrictions as to have jurisdiction only over both the colored constituency in Africa and in this country. It is a well-known fact that ever since my head came above the surface I have opposed with pen and voice the election of any other kind of a bishop than a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who must be a General Superintendent for all Methodists, white, yellow, brown, and any other color. Before I made that statement I spoke to Brother Penn and said to him, "If by making such a sacrifice, or compromise if you desire to call it such, I would favor the election of a bishop whose jurisdiction should extend only to all the colored work in our Church, do you think your people would oppose it, coming from me?" I understood him to say no. I am willing to make concession only to secure unification; furthermore, I want to say that if the colored people in any way at all would oppose such a thing I certainly would not stand here or anywhere else and tell them by the action of

this Commission or any other body to accept it. Moreover, I did not say, what I could have said, that after we got all together and found it necessary to have a second bishop for the colored membership, I would then follow my convictions and do my best to elect a General Superintendent who should have such connections with the Board of Bishops and the whole Church as I have advocated on this floor—namely, that he should have all the rights of any one else, therefore could be in the council and vote in the Board of Bishops or anywhere else that any other bishop could. When these two statements are put together, I would not now, under the circumstances, attempt in an unparliamentary way to reply to Brother Blake's other remarks. All of you know I nominated him for this Commission, and he is one of the ablest men in the New England Conference; but when the proper time comes I will be able to show that a strong man can say some things that are weak.

Edgar Blake: With the permission of the Commission, I would like to be permitted to withdraw those remarks from the record.

Bishop Hamilton: Then I want mine withdrawn, too.

The Chairman (Bishop McDowell): If there is no objection, the permission is granted. Now, what is the pleasure of the Commission?

Rolla V. Watt: We have had so much general discussion in the abstract upon the situation of the two Churches that I have doubted for some time whether we would get down to anything very definite or concrete, but we seem now to have come to the point where we not only have the report of the committee before us, but also some definite suggestions regarding it. I have understood from the first that we were sent here for a definite purpose and that we cannot very well go away from here without having done something more than talk; that we ought to reach, if possible, some definite agreement that we are willing to submit to the Churches. It has not occurred to me that we are responsible for what the Churches may do with it after we have submitted our recommendations. Dr. Lamar said the other day that some of these propositions agreed to by us might get through the General Conference by "hook or crook," whatever that may mean. Then some one said that after we get the propositions through the General Conference it might be difficult to get them through the Annual Conferences. It doesn't seem to me that we should concern ourselves about that matter. We should do the best that can be done in the interests of our Churches, or rather "of our Church," the great Church, and then leave the responsibility upon the General Conferences and upon the Annual Conferences. I believe that

now we have talked enough about the general proposition and ought, therefore, to get down to business. We have come long distances and there is already evidence of restlessness and some members will soon be going home and we shall be left where we cannot finish the job. I trust from this on we shall devote ourselves to something concrete with a view to getting through. Let us center upon a report.

The Chairman (Bishop McDowell): Mr. Watt did not mean by his suggestion to intimate to any member desiring to speak on the general question that a speech from him would not be welcome. Those of us who have exercised something of our privileges of speech would not feel quite comfortable if any one were now denied the same privilege.

Rolla V. Watt: I am perfectly willing to waive all the other speeches so far as I am concerned.

Bishop Cranston: I ventured to program myself for a speech yesterday, which speech is still in embryo. But I expressed myself as altogether willing to take my chances in the discussion that I know must ensue, and I think I would rather do it piece by piece as the pieces fit in than to undertake to throw it all out at one time, for fear the body might be overcome.

Frank Neff: I also am one of those who have not spoken, and I am perfectly agreeable to what Mr. Watt says, though I want to make one suggestion that has not been made. There has been a great deal said here in regard to possible strife and discord that may come if we endeavor to put through a plan of unification that is not acceptable to every one in both Churches. My whole life has been spent on the border, where there has been suffering all the time, and there is suffering to-day. I have never known anything but the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, side by side. I have never had a ministry, until within the last few months, but that my brother of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has stood right by my shoulder, preaching the same doctrines, with the same history, and with the same outlook for the human race in every particular. And yet he and I have had to fight each other! All my ministry, and all my life, that thing has been going on, and I want to call your attention to this phase of the case. I am pleading with you to have a very tender regard for that great stricken country along the border, where we go through this fight over and over. I have been prepared to give you some statistics on the work of the border States, and here are just a few of the facts. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has decreased in membership in Kansas and Oregon, while the Methodist Episcopal Church has decreased in Kentucky, and in Arkansas has the glorious record of a gain

of five members in the last ten years. Is not that marvelous? And this same strife has ensued all through that borderland, causing loss of means and effort. The men from the extreme North and South do not feel this question and suffer from it like we do. Dr. Ainsworth knows nothing about it in its practical applications, unless in some other pastorate. When I was a student in Boston University I was struck with the fact that they knew nothing about this problem, but on the border we know and we do suffer from it. While I am not speaking for all the laymen of that country, yet, in my judgment, the laymen of those great border States are asking, and asking sternly, that we do something. Now, one of two things can be done. While I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, yet I will venture this prophecy, that when we go back home, if we fail to accomplish something, the men of the border States will be asking us what we did, and when we say that we did nothing, they will ask why we failed. They will ask us, "Weren't the men of the South willing to meet you?" "Yes, they were fairly nice about it, and were willing to grant some things." "Then, why did you fail?" And our answer will be, "We failed because they were not willing to give us everything we asked!" And I believe that we are going to have to face the worst feeling that we have ever faced. And the same questions will have to be answered by the Commissioners of the Church, South. What I am praying for, men, is that we realize the tremendous obligation resting upon us. I want to remind you that you owe some obligation to the white folks along the border, just as well as to the negroes in the far North and far South. You owe something to us all along through there where we are torn to pieces, family and community interests all divided, and the work hindered. While I admit that nothing ideal has been presented, yet we must make the best of what has been presented, and we must undertake to put into effect the most practical thing that we have, even though it is not ideal. We cannot have the ideal. My ideal would be to have one Church as we had it before the trouble, that we would simply be one again, and be done with it. And I can see that with perfect clearness, though you cannot see it that way! That is my "ideal," one Church, South, and where one man would be just as acceptable in the North as in the South, and where the South would be perfectly willing to reach away up into New England and take Dr. Blake down there.

E. B. Chappell: We are willing to take him right now.

Frank Neff: I am speaking of something that is possible of accomplishment. I am a Southerner, and would never ask a Southerner to surrender his principles. We would not do it, and you would not ask a Northerner to surrender his principles.

We would not think much of each other if we did, but there is a vast difference between principles and application. And when you get to the final analysis it resolves itself into a question of expediency, of adopting rules to govern us; and, in fact, the underlying principle is "the greatest good to the greatest number" in the largest aspects of the kingdom of God throughout the entire world. I think that we should consider the terrible strife and waste and loss all along the border, and let us do the thing that we can, and go back to those who have sent us here and say that we were willing to do that which in the largest measure would bring about the desired result. So far as I am concerned I shall be satisfied to go on with some adaptation of the proposition submitted here, the last proposition of Judge Rogers; but the particular thing that I am pleading for is that we hear the voices of men all through the border country demanding that we give them some means of stopping the strife, so that we can stand together as a united body for the advance of the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. I have heard it intimated several times by my brethren of the South that they would have difficulty in getting through any adaptation of this plan. Do not forget that we shall have troubles of our own on that line. There is not a Commissioner from the Methodist Episcopal Church but will have his hands full all the way through if we accept any adaptation of any plan of that kind. We are standing on middle ground, trying to do the thing that is pleasing to the Lord, and we must go forward as men of courage, whatever the cost may be. Then when we conclude our work we are going out to try to get our Churches to approve what we have adopted here.

Abram W. Harris: The Regional Conferences begin where the General Conferences overlap. Here is the larger rectangle that represents China. In China the Regional Conferences ought to have larger powers, legislative or administrative, or both, as the case may be. Then I will make a larger rectangle and let it overlap the other rectangle representing the General Conference to indicate that the Chinese Conferences shall be represented and have some powers and privileges in the General Conference, but with more extended representation and perhaps in purpose than the membership in the United States. In other words, it might be as Ireland now is a small representation in the British Empire, but with this difference in Ireland, while it has this small representation, local self-government is impossible. If you make it a local self-government, you will have an Irish row somewhere in the world all the time. I think it is fair to limit the General Conferences because we have extended them in the Regional Conference and because this Re-

gional Conference has larger powers. I suggest that we use the name Major Regional Conference, which has the virtue of being more pleasing than Subregional.

John R. Pepper: I wonder if we realize that we have already had thirty-five speeches on this subject and that I am rising to make the thirty-sixth? A few years ago I was crossing the Atlantic Ocean and we had two days of very dense fog. The first morning of the fog I walked out toward the forward part of the ship and I looked ahead and saw high toward the "crow's nest" a great big painted sign which said, "Silence during fog." I have been thinking about this sign every day since I have been in this meeting, and it seems to me the old ship has had a good deal of fog. I have feared that I would contribute more haziness than blue sky, which is one reason why I have not spoken earlier. But I have some very deep and undying convictions on this subject. I have never wavered one minute in my faith that we shall reach a conclusion that will be as satisfactory as can be, and I believe it will happen before we leave here. I have always trained in the school of optimism about everything I think. Now, I want to speak from a lay standpoint entirely, and largely from that of a practical active business man. Combinations are in the air. There is no question but that almost everything in the world is combining. I have been more or less interested in eight different corporations for a number of years. I happen to be the president of five of them. Now, during the last ten years every one of those corporations has combined with some other institution, one of them four times, one of them three times, and all of them one or more times. Do you think it was easy to do that? No, it was not easy at all, because it demanded the displacement of officials. It meant all sorts of changes necessary to the new arrangements, changes of policies, changes of methods. Do you think they were all Methodists? Oh, no, some of them were Methodists and some Baptists and some Presbyterians and some were Catholics and some, I believe, belonged to the Christian Science Church and some were Jews, and I think some unreligious. Why did they want to make those combinations? Not all of them wanted to, but most of them did, and they did it because it was to their interest to do it. I grant you that is a very much lower plane than the one on which we are talking; but why should "the children of this world always be wiser than the children of light"? I don't see why. I think the thing that ought to be done can be done, and I think we are all satisfied that this thing we are talking about ought to be done. Looking at it as I do from a purely business standpoint, and I trust I have faith also, I want to call attention first of all to

the thing that Brother Neff has been talking about, and that is the awful waste that has been going on. The waste with reference to this thing is absolutely criminal. I have been on the Pacific Coast and in the Northwest three or four times, largely as a student of conditions out there. I went as a layman in order that I might see some things that I knew something about, but I did not know half I thought I knew about it until I got out there in the midst of it. I saw some most sorrowful sights. In one little town of not more than five thousand people we had a church on one side of the street and not fifty yards away was another church on the other side of the street belonging to the Methodist Episcopal Church—the two churches within fifty yards of each other. I made diligent inquiry and I found that one of those churches had most of the reliable good people of the community in it and that the other was living at a poor dying rate and was supported almost entirely by missionary funds. I said then, and I say now and I believe it in my heart, that we cannot ask God's blessing on such business as that. I think that is one reason why they have not prospered, because I do not believe God will bless any such lack of judgment and good religious sense on our part, so I feel that for reasons of economy of men and money unification ought to obtain. I know men out there who are almost martyrs. They are having a great deal harder time than our men in the mission fields. They are living on the most precarious sort of income. The men in the foreign fields have their troubles, but they are pretty sure of getting their salaries and they know what they have to live upon. Those men out there struggle against great odds and with very uncertain living for themselves and their families. We should correct that by unification. No secular business would ever permit such a thing as that. I do not know a corporation or a business firm of any sort that would permit it to go on six months. They would make some kind of combination that would do away with it, and we should do that too, as we should have sense enough and religion enough to do it, and I have confidence that we have both. Now, as to much of this talk that we will not be able to get something through this Church or the other Church. I think the moral effect of the announcement that we have practically agreed on a plan will have great weight in carrying that plan through the whole Church. I am not going to borrow trouble from what is coming afterwards. I have tried very hard to put off troubles day by day and not to take to-day the troubles that I shall have to-morrow, and I think we can well trust God and trust our Churches, as we are in earnest about this matter and desire to do the right thing; and I believe I will be justified by the Church and we shall not only get it through the General

Conferences, but that we shall get it through the Annual Conferences as well. I am free to say that to get it through both of these bodies will depend a great deal on the leadership we have in both cases. I think if we earnestly do the best we can with the light before us, and as God gives us wisdom to see, our Churches are going to appreciate very much what we have tried to do in all these days. The program for the reorganized Church will be absolutely thrilling. I can think of nothing that fills me with greater joy than the fact that, should we reunite and reorganize and set forward the day of great things for God, blessings are in store for us beyond anything that we can imagine at this time, and I am going to do my part earnestly to bring about a consummation so devoutly to be wished. I had a little more than I wanted to say, but I desire to close by stating that I came here with nearly all the apparel I have for this time of the year and I think I have enough to last until St. Valentine's day, and I am expecting to stay that long, if necessary, in order that we may do something worthy of this Commission and of the Church that sent us here. I am willing to agree to at least some adaptation of these documents that have been presented to us. I think they form a basis of what we can all more nearly agree upon than anything we have yet had. I believe God will lead us along the best path and I am going to use my clearest judgment to reach the wisest conclusion.

P. D. Maddin: For the sake of brevity and conciseness, I have reduced what I want to say to writing. I shall not read all that I have written, because many of the things have been rendered unnecessary by what other people have said. On May 10, 1911, the Joint Commission on Federation appointed by the M. E. Church and the M. E. Church, South, met in Chattanooga, Tenn., and adopted a report setting forth a plan of reorganization known as the "Chattanooga Plan," with the details of which you are familiar. When this report was presented to the General Conference of the M. E. Church, South, in 1914, the Committee on Church Relations made several recommendations and the General Conference took action upon them. Upon the question of the *colored membership* the Chattanooga resolutions provided in part as follows:

We suggest that the colored membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Protestant Church, and such other organizations of Colored Methodists as may enter into agreement with them may be constituted and reorganized as one of the Quadrennial or Jurisdictional Conferences of the proposed reorganization.

The General Conference made the following recommendation:

However, we recommend that the colored membership of the various Methodist bodies be formed into an *independent organization holding fraternal relationship* with the organized and united Church.

The General Conference of the M. E. Church in 1916 passed resolutions expressing approval of the general plans as "containing the basic principles of a genuine unification of the Methodist bodies of the United States," and declared itself in favor of the unification of the two branches of the Methodist Church. It made no specific recommendations respecting the colored membership. Commissioners were appointed by their respective Churches and entered upon the discharge of their duties. The M. E. Church, in its resolutions, said: "So sincerely do we believe that the union of the two Episcopal Methodisms is the will of God, and so earnestly and devoutly do we desire that these two Churches may be one, that we hereby authorize and instruct the Commissioners of the M. E. Church to conduct the negotiations in a generous and brotherly spirit." I can say to you on behalf of our entire Commission that you have followed these instructions of your Church, and you have met us upon every proposition in the most generous and brotherly spirit. From the action taken by our Church, I have felt that a duty was placed upon me to endeavor, within all reasonable limits, to reach a basis for unification. The Church desires it. The General Conference expects it. The report favoring it was passed by the unanimous standing vote of our General Conference. In our sessions at Baltimore and Traverse City we made excellent progress, creating tentative plans for the Conferences and for the Judicial Council. We have now come to what has seemed from the first to be the question on which we would have the most difficulty. The causes of these difficulties have already been made plain to you. Dr. Lamar has set them out in a frank and brotherly way, and Mr. White, with equal frankness and an equally brotherly spirit, has explained conditions as they existed in his State (Louisiana). A similar story could be told of conditions in Georgia, Tennessee, and throughout the South. The situation that confronts us to-day does not arise from any mere personal prejudice on the part of the members of their Commission, nor the people of the South. Personally, I have every reason to feel, and do feel, great interest in the welfare of the colored race. My maternal grandfather was a planter in Alabama and owned many slaves. He moved to Texas in the early fifties, taking his slaves with him, and there operated large plantations near Waco, Tex. When all the men and boys of the family went to war (for the boys went at sixteen and under), the slaves remained and cultivated the land and took care of the family. After they were emancipated, they still remained on the plantation, and at my grandfather's death, in 1882, nearly all his former slaves were still on the plantation, and most of them had bought from him their forty acres each,

and were happily growing in prosperity. My own children were nursed by the old mammy who had nursed their mother, and who, after forty-three years' continuous service in her father's family and her own, passed away beloved by each one of us, the mammy of all the children in the connection. She was buried from the family home, and was laid to rest in the family burying ground. Our Church has not done all for the negro it should have done, yet it has done a substantial amount. Paine College is maintained largely by direct appropriation from our Boards of Education and Home Missions. Every negro Methodist Church in Nashville, and doubtless in the South, has been helped with Methodist money. In addition to what the Church itself has done, and what individuals of the Church have done, for the negro, the Southern States have expended millions of dollars for the education of the negro. Beginning with Louisiana in 1864, all the Southern States had by 1870 established a public school system, which included the negro children. The amount contributed by these States for negro education up to 1916 is as follows:

	Invested in School Property for Negroes.	Taxes to Maintain Negro Schools in 1916.
Florida	\$ 370,299	\$ 258,093
Missouri	1,900,000	450,000
Louisiana	579,414	413,000
Oklahoma	1,200,000	551,000
Maryland	972,000	524,000
Georgia	1,369,077	763,173
Virginia	1,745,503	698,000
South Carolina	833,153	378,000
Texas	1,700,000	1,897,000
Arkansas	1,600,000	700,000
Kentucky	913,397	609,000
Alabama	813,772	507,000
Tennessee	1,350,000	770,000
North Carolina	1,021,736	674,000
Mississippi	500,000	570,000
Fifteen States	\$16,868,351	\$9,762,266

It is readily seen that this annual expenditure, carried back over the years, amounts to a vast sum. We, of course, bear in mind that most of these taxes are paid by white people. The Methodists constitute a large per cent of the population and consequently pay their part. There being few negroes in the North, they receive there only a small percentage of the school tax. I mention these figures not in a spirit of boasting, but merely to show that we of the South have done a substantial amount, and more particularly to say that the same men who found it necessary to pass the "grandfather clause" are at the same time paying for the education of the negroes. As to your work

in the South, it deserves the greatest praise. It is too extensive for detailed mention, but I will refer to one instance. You have Meharry College at Nashville. In December last 145 medical and dental students of that college were enlisted by the War Department in the Officers' Medical Reserve Corps and held for use when needed. This splendid contribution, at this period of national affairs, makes further comment unnecessary. There is a cordial feeling throughout the South between the two races. But there is a racial condition that exists, which for the best good of both races it has been necessary to recognize, and on account of which laws have been passed for the protection of the blacks as well as the whites. The "grandfather clause" and the "understanding clause" in some States, the "marked ballot" in others, were passed largely to prevent ignorant negroes from exercising the elective franchise, and from taking part in enacting legislation. The separate coach law, requiring *separate* but *equal* railroad accommodations to be provided by common carriers; the separation law in street-car travel, laws forbidding whites and blacks to sit in the same places at public amusements, or to eat at the same table in public hotels, all recognized these racial differences. Laws have been passed in 29 of the States, including all the Southern States, forbidding the intermarriage of whites and blacks. In the District of Columbia, and in several of the States, whites and blacks may intermarry; but if Fred Douglass and his white wife, lawfully married and residing in the District of Columbia, had come to live in Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, or Georgia, they would have been arrested and imprisoned. It is not surprising that the Southern States years ago found it necessary to take the elective franchise from the hands of the black race. As late as 1910 the percentage of illiteracy among the negroes was alarming. Out of every thousand people this percentage, in a few States taken as examples, was as follows: Tennessee, 273; Mississippi, 356; Georgia, 365; Alabama, 401; Louisiana, 484. It was, of course, greater in 1870. Contrast this for a moment with States in other sections: Minnesota stands at the top with only 34; Washington is third with 43; North Dakota is seventh with 48; and New York is eighth with 50. Again, let us see the ratio of white and colored in a few of the States as late as 1910; this was as follows:

	Whites.	Colored.
Mississippi	43.7	56.2 highest
Alabama	57.5	42.5
Georgia	54.9	45.1
Tennessee	78.0	21.0
Arkansas	71.8	28.2
Louisiana	56.0	43.0

The negro population was practically all in the South. In 1860 the total number of negroes in the United States was 4,441,000 and the total number of whites was 27,000,000. In 1910 the total number of negroes was 9,827,000 and the total number of whites was 82,000,000. In 1900 the total colored population was 8,834,000 against a white population of 67,000,000 and the total negro population outside of the South was 911,000. From these figures it is seen that as late as 1900 about 86 per cent of the entire negro population was in the South, so that the colored question and all the difficulties entering into it have rested mainly upon the South for solution. I refer to these conditions and laws, not for the purpose of calling up unpleasant things, but to show why, in the South, these laws have been found necessary. This necessity arose from conditions which we did not create, but which developed after the war. These laws were passed to prevent racial conflict and race friction, to promote public peace and quietude, and to prevent the taint of mixed blood. We must bear in mind that in the millions of negroes in the South there are to be found millions who are uneducated, millions who are un-Christian, many who are vicious and lawless. The highly educated and Christian negroes we meet here on this Commission are not the average of their race. They are the two who, both in education and Christianity, stand at the head. Laws, both civil and ecclesiastical, must take to account the average of the race, not alone the best. So with all these things to consider, you will not think us unreasonable, unsympathetic, nor unfriendly to the negro if we admit that we find difficulties in determining the best place for him in the reorganized Church. We should endeavor, as Christian men, to do what seems best for the negro himself. He should be given a man's chance to grow and develop, to attain to self-government and racial and ecclesiastical independence. We should not, in fixing his status, keep him subordinate; that will create and increase race friction and race conflict, and will be an injustice to him. Now, coming to the plans under consideration: The Federal Council at Chattanooga suggested: "That the colored membership of the Methodist Church and the Methodist Protestant Church, and such other organizations of the colored Methodists as may enter into agreement with them, may be constituted and recognized as one of the Quadrennial or Jurisdictional Conferences of the proposed reorganization." The Church, South, General Conference recommended: "That the colored membership of the various Methodist bodies be formed into an independent organization, holding fraternal relationship with the reorganized and united Church." The alternative plan suggested by our committee con-

tains nearly this idea, in placing them in an Associate General Conference, with control over their own affairs. In my opinion this last is the better plan, and for the following reasons: It offers a better opportunity for self-government and racial and ecclesiastical development—the right to direct and control their own affairs, elect their own bishops, have their own newspapers, books, and magazines, constitute their own boards, and, in fact, to have independence. Under this plan the negro would continue to receive all the aid financially as before, together with the counsel, advice, and coöperation of the united Church. This plan would be more attractive to other bodies of negroes and would result in more rapid growth. The first plan puts them into a Subregional Conference with a limited vote in the General Conference. That plan simply makes them a dependency on the white membership. Their vote cannot get them anything. They cannot pass a single measure that the white members oppose. It weakens them instead of strengthening them. Racially they continue and will always be dependent—subordinate. Other colored Methodists would not join them and become subordinate. Other colored persons, not members of any Church, would not be attracted to them; they prefer more independence. The result would follow that there would never be any unification among the colored Methodist Churches, no considerable increase in the negro membership of the united Church, and no racial development arising from their membership in the united Church. The history of the colored Church for sixty years shows that the negro prefers an independent organization, and is not inclined to join any Church dominated by whites. Statistics show the following: The M. E. Church had a colored membership in 1916 of 308,551. All the white Churches together had a colored membership aggregating 514,571. Now, let us go to the independent negro denomination:

Colored Methodist Episcopal.....	240,798
African Methodist Zion Church.....	568,608
African Methodist	620,000
Baptist	2,261,000
	<hr/>
	3,690,406

The independent colored Churches then had in all 3,690,406 members, over seven times the total colored membership of white Churches. Again, with all that the Methodist Church has done for its negro members, it had, as above stated, 308,551 colored members, while the C. M. E. Church, with little done for them, had 240,798—only 68,000 less than the M. E. Church, and this in 57 years' growth. These figures demonstrate that the negroes as a race love their independence more than they love our counsel.

Again, the total property of M. E. Church negroes is \$6,104,000, or about \$20 per capita. The total property of all the independent negro Churches is \$45,191,000, or only about \$12 per capita. This shows that the negroes prefer independence with poverty to subordination with comparative wealth, even though that wealth was largely donated wealth. Why not give them what they as a race manifestly want? Why place them where they as a race manifestly do not want to be? The M. E. Church's colored members seem to prefer to stay where they are; but should we not look further to the others of the race and not just to 308,000? We certainly must consider and provide for our own 240,000 negroes in the C. M. E. Church. As to the work accomplished by negroes under the various conditions: Independent negro Baptists carry on mission work in five countries. They have 51 stations, 83 out-stations, 43 organized churches in mission fields, 43 native workers, 451 other helpers, and 14,700 missionary communicants. The African Methodist work is carried on in eight foreign countries. They have two bishops in Africa, 118 ordained ministers, 479 unordained ministers, and 17,178 communicants. They spent on Foreign Missions in 1915 the sum of \$48,345. These are both independent negro Churches. I have not been able here to get the statistics showing what the negro members alone of the M. E. Church have done in this direction, but the figures read to-day by Dr. Penn show that it was less, notwithstanding the great help given them by the M. E. Church. Again, in 1910, there was in the United States a total negro population of 9,827,000. The total negroes in all Churches was 4,300,000. It is seen that over 5,550,000 negroes in the United States are not in any Church at all. Independence, as shown by statistics, is seven times as attractive to them as subordination. Why not urge your negro members to establish a Church with greater independence and endeavor thereby to reach these 5,550,000 negroes who are not in any Church? In deciding what place should be given to the negro in the reorganized Church, we should not disregard the negroes who were formerly connected with our own Church, 240,000 of them. They were set off in 1870, at their own request. They have been independent for fifty-seven years. They would not accept a subordinate relation in any Church. They might combine with another substantially independent organization of Methodist negroes. We should make a plan that at least would give them a fair opportunity to come in if they so desire. From a recent issue of one of your leading Church papers it appears that in response to a questionnaire sent out to the members of your last General Conference 400 replies were received. Of these, 13 per cent

expressed a preference for an independent Church for the negro; 75 per cent preferred a separate General Conference; 50 per cent of the colored delegates voted for a separate General Conference. You have seen from the views expressed by a number of our members of the committee that they favor an absolutely independent Church for the negroes. Others favor a Regional Conference with limited representation in the General Conference. The last plan reported from the committee combines these plans. It puts the negroes into a Regional Conference with limited representation in the General Conference until the membership reaches 600,000, and then they automatically become an Associate General Conference with full autonomy. They can elect their boards, elect their bishops, and be bishops to manage their own affairs, run their own Church, and still continue to receive aid and counsel from the white Church. This plan applies not only to the negro, but to all the races in all the Regional Conferences. This will hold out to the negro an independence which he should covet, and which I believe he will strive to attain. It releases him from the ecclesiastical control of any one. It will develop him individually and racially. It gives him a man's chance. It will attract other members and make growth more rapid. If they desire, it may draw to them other negro Methodists for unification. The white Church will still give him counsel, assist through connectional boards in directing his affairs, and extend to him such financial aid as his need may require. This plan may not to-day give him the condition we think best for him, but it will come. In ten years, perhaps in five, the negro membership may increase to 600,000. If so, the plan must be a good one for him. It will certainly result in bringing into the Church a larger number of negroes than will come in in a subordinate relation. In any event, brethren, our Church has approved of unification and appointed us to formulate and report a plan. Let us discharge that duty. Let us report a plan. If there are points upon which we do not agree, let the General Conference decide them, so that in the near future unification may come, and all the waste of men, of money, and of effort may be stopped, the friction at the border points of contact be relieved, and a united Methodism move with all its power for the forces of good, against the forces of evil, and for the Christianization of the world.

David G. Downey: Would it be permissible to make clear one point in Mr. Maddin's paper?

The Chairman (Bishop McDowell): I think so.

David G. Downey: Mr. Maddin made a statement about a vote having been taken and reported in one of the papers and

that it was reported that seventy-five per cent—I simply desire to state that that was only seventy-five per cent of fifty per cent.

P. D. Maddin: Seventy-five per cent of the replies received.

David G. Downey: Also that there were other matters that would have to be taken into consideration to understand the merits of the matter.

Bishop Cranston: This morning Dr. Goucher brought us to the consciousness of our real errand and called for better progress toward its consummation. Surely by this time we understand the difficulties that beset both sides. It was perhaps necessary that we should again traverse this same ground, for, looking ahead just a few weeks to the time when all that is said here shall be put into print and go before the two Churches, we may readily anticipate that these final reviews will be an education for both of the Churches and probably go far toward determining the conclusions that shall be reached by both bodies. But two or three points have been raised in our present discussion which it seems to me might well have been taken as already settled. For example, the General Conferences, by their action, have made it altogether unnecessary for us to be discussing the rights of the negro in our Church from a Scriptural standpoint, because the General Conferences have practically relegated this whole question (the relations of the negro to the Churches) to the ground of expediency. Sometimes that word has been timidly approached here, as if it were almost a sin to suggest expediency as a ground of action by this body. With our radical individual differences as to the ethical teachings of the New Testament on our crucial point, how can we come to any kind of an agreement except on the ground of expediency? And this is what our Churches have done in the plainest possible way. The General Conferences, in that mutual covenant by which each certified to the Methodistic integrity and Scriptural apostolicity of the other Church, acted with all their past differences in regard to slavery and the negro race before them. They had not, in earlier years, spoken of or to each other in such terms as those in which they at last very deliberately declared this mutual confidence. But now, by treaty agreement, these Churches are both apostolic in spirit, and both historically, doctrinally, and experimentally of equal standing, and this in the face of all these differences in the past as to the negro. Shall we assume to review the treaty? And where have they left this question if not in the domain of expediency? By the logic of the situation this Commission must reach conclusions not by its own judgment applied to points already settled by its principles in solemn treaty pledges, but in the following of its definite instructions which certainly do admit expediential considerations. We may, therefore,

consistently accept the report of the Committee on the Status of the Negro, if not just as it stands, at least in its general propositions. It is the only way by which we can approach an adjustment. It comes with an alternative suggestion which has been admitted as part of the report. There is a question, in the minds of some, as to whether the rights of the negro are being invaded, whether the report tends to crowd him out of his rights and place in the Methodist Episcopal Church. I am going to admit to you very frankly that I see no such intimation in the report of the committee. Some two or three years ago, our Negro Annual Conferences initiated a new proposition to so amend the constitution of the Church as to allow bishops for races or languages—the whole movement looking directly to the election of colored bishops for administration among themselves. When Bishop Hamilton addressed himself to the *New York Advocate* opposing that amendment in what he regarded as the interest of the negro people who were asking for it, I thought enough of him and of the negro to undertake to set him right by following him in a reply printed in the same paper. I have here, in my little pouch, a number of documents, and among them are several letters from our colored leaders outside of those who projected that movement, and I never have received more hearty thanks than came from some of the most reliable and best educated of these colored people for what I said in their behalf. How under the sun you are giving the negro a man's chance while you hold him in constant legislative subordination to an overwhelming white majority and without any power of initiative except under a handicap almost fatal to his aspirations, I cannot see. I firmly believe that the way to manhood is to begin to be a man, and to take on a man's responsibilities. I had a dear old relative who had several fine boys. He gave but one of them responsibility in his business; and when he died there was just that one of those boys who had any degree of capacity to take hold of business affairs. He had given the others educational training, but a more helpless lot of good men would be hard to find. Temperate, true, and honorable every one of them, but without the power of initiative or self-direction. I feel a larger sympathy for my colored brethren who are full of aspirations for freedom of movement than for those who are willing to be hot-housed perpetually. Say what you will, there is, in the relation of the two races, however friendly they may be, the element of brotherly compulsion on the one side and acquiescence to the other. Now, if you ask me if the proposed Associate General Conference puts the colored people outside of our Church, I say No. The establishment of an Afro-American Associate General Conference is not pushing these brethren beyond

our Church. It is not a segregated relation. It is an ecclesiastical fellowship representing but one spiritual communion, which has its beginning in the heart of God and as its bond the spirit of divine love communicated to all human hearts which are born of the Spirit. Christian fellowship is spiritual. 'It does not inhere in any ecclesiastical scheme, nor can it be given or taken away by any human authority. I suppose, if you come to discuss the rights of man as man, you will have to admit that, while all men are equal before God, every man is born to like freedom of opportunity and self-direction so far as capable of it. To deliberately repress the intelligent and attainable aspirations of any human being is a sin against heaven, we may say, but at the same time we must concede that, in voluntary community existence and community life in community organizations such as our Churches, we must be governed by the same rules and principles that necessarily obtain in such community organizations and coöperative movements in general. In the divinely organized family the child is in subjection, though a human being. In an ordinary partnership the partner who has invested but one-tenth of the capital employed does not assume more than proportionate power in the direction of the affairs of the concern. The more we talk of fundamental rights the harder we make the case for our brothers whose interest we are all trying to serve. Then, as to the matter of numerical representation in the General Conference: Brethren, if I have learned anything in my experience in Church legislation and general administration, I have learned this—that the influence of a representative delegation in any body, or a race representation in any form of administration, does not depend upon the number of men representing that race or a particular Conference. It depends upon the quality, not the quantity of the representation. Do you not know that as you add to your delegation numerically there is a constant tendency to reduce the quality? Comparatively a few men in a few delegations direct the affairs of your General Conference and ours. How? Not because there is any lack of interest in the rest of the delegates, but simply because these men can do things best, and have it in their hearts to do them, combine the qualities essential to leadership. Safeguarding the right of representation in the matter, we are next to conform our plan to our problem in the concrete. I would a great deal rather, if our Churches could both be made to see the question in the same light, that our colored membership should have just the kind of representation that these brethren ask; but it is manifest that just that thing cannot be realized, and we face the alternative of an adjournment, without any plan to report to our Churches, or devising

some such all-round concession as this report proposes; and while even in the choice of expedients I would like to have our colored brethren pleased, I must declare my convictions that the rights of the kingdom of Jesus Christ amid the imminent perils of our chaotic world cannot reasonably or justly be subordinated to the ecclesiastical ideas of any class of our membership, and this I would say, even if I did not believe their representatives to be absolutely mistaken in their conception of what is best for their people. I had hoped I would not have to say these things, but I do not want any share of the responsibility for an adjournment here without action in fulfillment of our Commission. No greater disaster could befall Methodism in the United States. It will go abroad to China, where they are praying for our union, and it will dishearten the missionaries. It will go through all the ranks here from one end of our lines to the other as a kind of proclamation that the old war is still on, after all our fraternal professions through all the years. John Morley, after wrestling with the problems of Ireland, as a champion of Irish Home Rule, and after five years struggling with the problems of the British Empire in India, meeting Booker Washington for the third time, according to his journal, added this comment—I quote the substance of it from memory: “We talk about our Irish problems and our problems in India, but it is my opinion that the most difficult problem now confronting any nation is the negro problem in America. Think of the time ahead when the blacks will be multiplied to forty or fifty millions, with the difficulties increasing all the time. It is perplexing.” I give the substance and not the words. Think of that great man, with his ability and experience in cabinet administration, taking such a view as that of issues that we are trying to settle here in a few days as far as our two Churches are concerned. Unless we can reach some agreement by which the relations between these two races shall take a better turn than the direction in which facts are pointing to-day, we shall have failed to serve our Churches and our generation as God evidently expects us to serve them at this crisis. Brethren, my own feeling is that the compulsion of resistless demand is upon us, and that we *must* agree. I am glad you caught sight of that card, Doctor Bishop, “*We can do it if we will.*” I would not like to be the man who stands in the way of doing it. I would not like to take his place when men come to be judged. Indeed, I would not like to take his place before either of these Churches, for, as surely as you and I live, the masses of our Churches do not care a bauble about many of the things to which we are devoting a great deal of time. All they want is the right to manage their own home Church affairs, to be sure that they are on the way to heaven,

and to be protected from outside dictation. That is as far as they go. I can go back home and give a lot of reasons why we should ask more of you, and you brethren on the other side can go back home and give a lot of reasons why you should demand larger concessions of us; but frankly, brethren, I think that would be absolutely wicked. Why instruct them in the things that have made us so much trouble? Let them go their simpler way believing in the teachings of Jesus Christ; and they will go with more certainty and comfort if they know that every dollar they give for home missionary operations will be profitably and religiously expended, that the work of Methodism will be harmoniously administered, and they will give their foreign missionary money with better hearts and in larger amounts if they catch the thrill of the great united movement which we are now planning to give world evangelism a victorious push under the leadership of our one Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

M. L. Walton: I have been a silent listener here for some days and without any particular desire to participate in the discussions, though I have felt an absorbing and a burning interest in connection with the other Commissioners in the subject which has been engaging our attention, and which has been productive of this great discussion on the important questions that are now pending before us. We come here, not as representing our own individual or personal views, except as those views are reflected as representatives—representatives in a double sense; first, as members of this Commission; and, secondly, as representatives of our respective Churches—I may say constituency. We come here with what I regard as very positive and clear instructions. I do not say that those instructions may not be varied from or that they are not flexible in some respects; but, as a representative, I think it is our duty to hold to and maintain as fully, adequately, and conscientiously as we can. I do not look upon them, however, in the light of presenting an ultimatum, or the last word, but I do think we must gather from them their true import and what the General Conference of 1914 desired us to accept as its views. That General Conference did two things, one of which would have been sufficient in itself. It pronounced affirmatively in favor of unification, and then submitted a tentative plan for its consummation. I was not a member of the last General Conference, though I was first alternate. My presence was desired, but on account of legal engagements I could not be present, and therefore had nothing to do with the passage of these resolutions. I was appointed on this Commission during my absence from the Conference, and without being an actual member of the Conference, though I had previously been

appointed as a member of the Federation Commission at the Birmingham General Conference in 1904, and then at Asheville in 1910, and reappointed in 1914 at Oklahoma City. When this authority came to me I felt that it was my conscientious duty to do anything and everything I possibly could to attain unification, but believed that, to a large and considerable extent, the obtaining of results was somewhat limited by the positive instructions which we received in the nature of recommendations of our Conference. I was very sorry that the action that was taken in 1910, at the first Chattanooga meeting—especially after the representatives of the Methodist Episcopal Church knew the minds of the membership of the Council as it was constituted of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and as the action so taken and formulated there was embodied in and became the basis of our authority here—was not incorporated in the action taken by the General Conference at Saratoga. I took the liberty of writing Bishop Cranston, saying to him in the most brotherly fashion that the closer his Conference adhered to the action specifically taken by our General Conference at Oklahoma City, to that extent and in that ratio, in my opinion, was there a stronger probability of the accomplishment of unification. Now, that failure has produced the difficulty here. Another thing that has produced difficulty has been the colored man—and when I say colored man, I do not care to speak of a man who is colored as a negro. I do not do it in any offensive sense. I want to see this question so put by both of these General Conferences that there will be no question about this matter of unification. If unification is the good thing that both Conferences say it is, if it is both desirable and feasible, we should accomplish it. When you make the colored man conspicuous as you do here, and hold him up so that he becomes a target, just to that extent must we suffer depreciation, and I might say vituperation, at the hands of a great many people. You raise a class distinction which has done, in my opinion, infinite harm and injury to the propagation of this case. I see no necessity for doing anything of that kind. I believe these questions would solve themselves and that their solution would be found in the intensity of our Christian fellowship and Christianity according to New Testament principles and doctrines as therein laid down. I possess no race prejudices. My parents owned slaves. I have a son, to-day, who is a commissioned officer at Camp Lee, Va., who has under him and in his training a colored company of whom he writes very kindly and proudly, respecting their obedience and what good soldiers they make. Another reason why I did not want to speak was a desire to economize time. I have no prejudices against the Methodist

Episcopal Church. In other cities, I go to their communion. I have a daughter who graduated at the Woman's College at Lynchburg, Va., and having married a son of Maryland, she went there to make her future home, and the question was, "Shall I transfer my membership?" And I said, "Yes, take your certificate to the M. E. Church"; and she did, and has found a hearty welcome where she is, and is also happy in her new Church relations. I make no question about these things. As a member of the Virginia Senate, I became the author of what was known as the "Walton Election Law," which was incorporated into the Constitution of 1902. I did not insist on any "grandfather clause" or scheme, but what I did do was to put in a provision equivalent to an educational qualification. Yet there was no discrimination between whites and blacks with reference to that. There was just as much requirement of the one as of the other, and this law was tested before our Court of Appeals and the President of that court held that it was constitutional. He also delivered a most learned opinion with reference to it in which he sustained not only the pure motives back of it, but held the object of it to avoid fraud and debauchery. As a consequence our elections have been fair and nobody can justly complain of them. I do not say that so far as the Southern States were concerned they ought not to have protected themselves against the supremacy of the colored man. One amongst the beautiful tablets in this city exemplifies the idea that "blood is thicker than water." It is only some of the colored people of which complaints can be made. I heard my father speak of it when he was a member of the Constitutional Convention of Virginia, when the State was under the carpetbag rule and the Underwood Constitution was adopted in 1867, as to the insults and gibes received at the hands of some adventurers and carpetbaggers that had come down to Richmond and were using them as instruments to draw the chestnuts out of the fire. It does seem to me that there ought to be some solution to this great question, and that it ought to be accomplished by consulting one with the other, looking to the interest, perpetuity, progress, and advancement of our respective Churches. But, is it true that the *sine qua non* of the Methodist Episcopal Church is that you cannot accept anything unless it grants and vouchsafes to you colored representatives? If it is, the Commission I represent says we cannot risk that. There is then no middle ground? Principles are involved, you say, and they cannot be compromised, and how is the matter to be adjusted under the circumstances? Is there anything to do except to go home? We have been trying this for years, and here we are, Christian men, Christian brothers, looking at the very best interest, as we believe,

of our respective Churches and desiring the advancement of God's kingdom in the earth, and particularly with reference to the Churches of Methodism. However, I do not believe it is a good idea to commit this matter to a coöperative committee, as Dr. Lamar was suggesting the other day, for that is no other than a matter of federation, and what did we accomplish by federation? There was no achievement whatever. When we consulted about this question of procedure at Ocean Grove and Baltimore and Cincinnati and Chattanooga and all over the country, we finally adopted a method of procedure. Then, when we came to Atlanta we had one concrete case before us, and I recollect distinctly at our meeting Bishop Hoss' insisting that we go on with the settlement of that case. I recall the almost pathetic speech that Bishop McDowell made, my brother Simpson, and others. The argument was, let us not go into the merits of that case or we will obscure the real question which we are after here, or we shall engender bitterness, which shall becloud the greater question of unification. I recall how, on one side, Bishop Denny accepted that and then how a subcommittee was gotten up and the whole matter was tided over, so that nothing was done. Therefore, I do not think any good is going to come out of any such relation as that. You might as well dismiss it from your minds for future consideration, as far as that is concerned. It will be well accepted here that, unless the adjustment of this matter shall receive the approval of our respective General Conferences, and then from the Annual Conferences, our action will be nugatory and all this will substantially be wasted time—I do not say in the cultivation of brotherhood or fellowship or the graces of religious fellowship. We might have met under other circumstances and in all probability some cultivation of these graces have reached as far above the zenith as here; but, notwithstanding, we must have a plan that will be accepted by our people. At the last session of the Baltimore Conference, held in the city of Roanoke, Dr. Bray, of the Colored Methodist Church that we set off, appealed to us, saying, "We are getting a little jealous of what the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is doing in its treatment of the colored members of the Methodist Episcopal Church. We have our eyes on you, and we will want to know why you favor them in preference to us, when we are your wards, we are your children." We cannot afford to give that loyal body of men any offense by any action taken here. Then there is another question we must look squarely in the face, and it has not been mentioned by any one thus far that I know. That is whether or not, if the Southern Methodist Episcopal Church agrees to representation, even though it be minority representation, on the Supreme Court or Judicial Council or

General Council, or that gives them minority representation in the General Conference, where they can legislate finally with reference to the white constituency; the question arises whether that will cause any appreciable embarrassment to those now communicants of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. I have heard a great many statements made about that. I don't know to what extent it exists. I have heard large figures quoted, and from eminent men I have heard the statement which afterwards was corrected and modified, so what the true situation is, I do not know. I know in my own local congregation there will likely be some members to leave the Church if unification is to be on such a basis. I know one of the most prominent officials of my Church who has come out in one or two strong articles opposing unification. Thus, I say, it is a situation that is fraught with difficulty, and the fundamental question is whether we shall permit, as Christian brethren, 350,000 colored people to defeat unification, which is for the benefit of more than 6,000,000. That is the paramount question here. It seems to me, as I said to Dr. Penn the first time I met him, when we were up at the Northwestern University making addresses, after he approached me in a very brotherly manner and remarked that he had formerly lived in Lynchburg, Va., that he and Dr. Christian had lived in Lynchburg, where they played together as boys, was complimentary of Dr. Penn's attainments and what he had accomplished in the meantime. I said to Dr. Penn then, "I am your friend, and I believe the best thing you can do is to assert your independence, manifest your Americanism. You have brain, you have money, and you have friends. You have interest in the Publishing Houses and other institutions, and why not establish yourself separately and independently—in other words, stand on your own feet and assert your inalienable rights?" But the Doctor did not think then that anything of that kind could or ought to be done. I do not think anything can be legally done; so far as expulsion is concerned, unless there is some misbehavior or misconduct, and I am satisfied they are not going to be guilty of anything of that kind. Hence there would be no ground for expulsion. But, brethren, that would be the happiest solution of this whole matter. Then we would not have to stand here as patron saints clamoring for the rights of these people, because these people have their constitutional rights and can assert them and maintain them. Back of them would be the whole Church, buttressed and fortified, ready to uphold them and sustain them—yea, to uplift them and further them in all their interests. I, for one, wish they would recognize the fact that there is no desire to abridge their rights. We are not talking about the Constitution of the United States, or those

two amendments which were adopted for their benefit. We have gotten away from the war. I saw a great deal of it as a child, and I know it was horrible, because I suffered in my own home. I can remember the terrible conditions, when in order to have coffee we were compelled to resort to the use of parched rye, and instead of sugar we used sorghum molasses and various substitutes of that kind. It was recognized that the far-famed Shenandoah Valley, in its resources, was as badly desolated as any section of country could be. You may recall that an order was given that everything should be taken so that even "if a crow flew over the Valley he would be compelled to carry his haversack with him." When I saw homes, in my native town, torn up and burned, and destroyed fields laid waste, property rights devastated, I felt very bitterly about it. But, thank God, through his grace, I have forgotten those things, and I stand in a new day with my face turned toward the rising sun. What I want to see accomplished is whatever is for the best interests of Southern and Northern Methodism too, so as to make us one homogeneous whole. But there are various points and interests to be safeguarded. Let us not be carried off our feet by the indulgence of some kind of sentimentality. We must be soberly serious. And then, in the last place, whatever is done, whatever conclusions are reached to the mutual satisfaction of the contracting parties respectively, should be abiding and lasting, so that we shall not have any more 1884's. We desire such a lasting peace as this great country and her allies want to make, and will not be content with any other situation with Germany and her allies. Then we shall have the Prince of Peace reigning in all our hearts, homes, and lives. I love my Church next to my God. I love your Church—all its interests in the great work it has done. I love Bishop Cranston, who has been a benediction in my home, preached in our pulpit, and helped my people, who are fond of him. They wanted to see him and he came. We felt honored in having him in our homes. What I want to see done is the carrying out, the execution of, the orders of the authorities that have been put in our hands as the respective representatives of our Church, what is for the very best interests of the Church and the glory of God. This is real unification, and it is within our grasp. Shall we accept it, or dash the chalice from our lips?

A. J. Lamar I rise to a question of personal privilege. I dislike to do that, because I think we have had enough of personal privileges; but my friend Judge Walton evidently misunderstood one thing in the remarks I had the privilege of making the other day. I do not propose to counsel coöperation as a substitute for unification. I devoutly believe in unification,

and I want to bring it to pass. The record, if you will examine it, will show that I said about this: "I do not believe, with the difference of opinion existing here, that we can arrive at unification at this time"—and my proposal of the Council of Cooperation was simply a proposal of a bridge to bridge over the difficulty until unification did come. It would hold good if we were to agree here unanimously on a recommendation to our General Conference. We have a year or two years, in all probability four years and possibly six years, until unification could actually be completed and put into operation, and something would be needed during that time. That was my intention, not as a substitute for unification, but simply as a bridge over the difficulties between now and the time when that unification will be complete.

M. L. Walton: I understood Dr. Lamar to say substantially what he has just repeated; but I said to him, I know, at the time, that I think your Coöperative Committee is a kind of misnomer and it is really a Committee on Federation, and we know that has been an absolute failure.

A. F. Watkins: Judge Walton's reference to the "grandfather clause" reminds me that I have desired, as a matter of personal privilege, to say that, through a misapprehension of the bearing of the "grandfather clause" in Louisiana, I did the constitution of that State and my friend Judge White an injustice in my speech the other day. I wish to say that the clause as confirmed in Louisiana has no bearing whatever upon the exercise of the elective franchise by the negro, but its bearing is simply that which looks toward the extension of that franchise to those who, under the general provision limiting the exercise of that right by which the exercise of the privilege might be granted to certain other persons, and in what I said declaring the conviction that the "grandfather clause" operated permanently to limit the exercise of the franchise by the negro was unjust.

W. N. Ainsworth: The suggestions that are before us in definite form looking to the solution of the pending difficulties concern the work both of the Committee on Conferences and the Committee on the Status of the Negro. It seems to me, therefore, that some conference between those committees might now lead to some definite proposition upon which we could take action. I therefore rise to present this resolution:

Be it resolved, That the Committee on Conferences and the Committee on the Status of the Negro be requested to meet on adjournment this afternoon and make up a Special Joint Committee of Eight, four from each committee, and to select a committee from the two Churches of which said committee is hereby requested to meet this evening and harmonize as far as possible the several reports from the several committees and report on the same to-morrow.

I present that resolution now and I hope that it may meet with favor.

Bishop Cranston: A separate report from each committee?

W. N. Ainsworth: Yes.

The resolution was seconded.

Bishop Denny: There is only one objection. There might be very helpful results come about, but the limitation to report to-morrow might lead to something other than a thorough consideration of the questions involved and so bring us a report that might be anything else than adequate to the end that we have in view. I do not like the limitation as to bringing in that report to-morrow. I don't know that any committee that could be appointed could really go through the questions involved in that time.

W. N. Ainsworth: I think it would be readily agreed, if the committee should report here to-morrow morning that they needed more time, that we would quite willingly give them additional time. And it need not be understood by the committee when appointed that they must bring back a report to-morrow, even if such is involved in the resolution. They might be able to bring their most mature thought by to-morrow, because they have been thinking about it in both committees; but if they want more time, it will be granted.

A vote being taken, the resolution was agreed to.

Frank M. Thomas: The records of the Joint Commission and the debates, especially at Chattanooga, show that when the series of suggestions were framed that were afterwards reported to the two General Conferences there was considerable discussion with reference to the union of the various branches of the colored Methodist Churches. At Chattanooga, for instance, J. A. Patton introduced the following paper:

Whereas the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has instructed its Federated Commissioners to further the union of the colored Churches, and all our General Conferences have brought us responsibilities relative to the welfare of the negro Methodists of America; and whereas the Methodist Episcopal Church has appointed a Special Commission, distinct from the Commission on Federation, to consider the interests of the colored Methodists; and whereas the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church has also named a Commission to consider the same question;

Be it resolved, That this Joint Federation Commission request the Special Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Commission from the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church to communicate to us, to aid us in furthering our work, any conclusions reached, and other information of importance at their disposal.

And those suggestions were drawn up and I happened to be the Secretary of the first Committee of Nine. We had before us documents touching that matter and the interest of not only

the colored membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church was considered, but the interests of the members of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, and I feel, in view of this history and our relations to the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, and in view of the fact that the suggestions now before us do provide for the incorporation of the colored Methodists and of the negroes now in the Methodist Episcopal Church in the reorganized Church, the interest of the colored Methodist Episcopalists with reference to this reorganization might also be considered by the Joint Committee.

The Chairman (Bishop McDowell): Do you make any motion?

Frank M. Thomas: I move that they take that under advisement also.

The motion was seconded.

R. E. Jones: The letters which I have from the bishops of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church warrant me in saying that it will be entirely distasteful to them to have us consider a relation which they are not asked to have any hand in making. Somebody said, "Blood is thicker than water," and being a negro and knowing just how those men feel, I do not think it would be doing them justice to have their cause considered unless you are going to invite them in. Dr. Thomas, whether you know it or not, that is exactly the way they feel. Maybe they have not told you so. You can do as you please about it, but I think I should tell you how they feel, and that is the way they feel, and it is no secret in their correspondence to me. And, seriously, brothers, it is not courtesy to talk about a change of their relations without having them here and I would not for a moment consider it.

David G. Downey: I do not see how we can fitly consider any class that is not represented here. I agree with Dr. Jones that it is hardly courtesy and I hardly think it is essential to our problem. I do feel, of course, that it is a matter that we have to bear in mind; but indeed, I think it would be very unwise for us to commit such a matter to a committee to make definite report upon at this time.

Frank M. Thomas: I wish that merely transmitted for consideration because of the history of the matter in the Joint Commission, and also on account of some practical problems involved; but I will say, and I am not going to make a speech, that you are going to form a Church along the lines we have been considering to-day and you are not forming them for any particular branch of negroes: you are forming them for a world Church. The point I am making is this, that some provision ought to be made whereby a Church, such as the Colored Methodist

Episcopal Church, could come into such a body with the least friction possible.

Joseph W. Van Cleve: In view of the situation we have before us and the fact that there are no representatives from that Church and that there never have been, that I have heard, any overtures from that Church looking toward any unification, and that there have never been any overtures from either of the Churches concerned in this Commission to that Church, I do not think we should now take that matter under consideration at all. I am deeply interested in the unification of colored Methodism, as in the unification of Methodism as a general proposition. It is desirable and important, but I do not think we should anticipate any of these Churches not yet connected with any of these negotiations in any way—I do not believe we should make their affairs in any sense matters of consideration here. I think we should leave the gate open for anybody, but it ought to be left open simply to those Churches to avail themselves of the opportunity which we leave for every one of them alike.

E. B. Chappell: It seems to me it would be entirely proper.

Frank M. Thomas: It was part of the suggestion of the two General Conferences.

E. B. Chappell: It seems to me it would be entirely proper for this committee to make these suggestions and to recommend to the representatives of these two Churches, and to recommend to the respective General Conferences, a plan for inviting these colored Churches to come in. Therefore, I do not think we should not consider any Church. If we want to consider the Protestant Methodist Church, I think we have a right to consider it and to take steps to invite those people to come in.

I. Garland Penn: I think we would be taking a serious step, and one that might prove to be very unpleasant and prejudice the case, if we should undertake to consider any other Methodism save what we are considering as a Joint Commission. I chance to know something of the feelings of these brethren who are considered at these meetings without having a representative here, and you do not help the case at all when you start out to consider them without being represented by personal representatives. I might quote from a bishop of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, who said this was not a quarrel of theirs and they hoped that they would not be mentioned in this matter, and I think that, until their General Conference shall appoint Commissioners upon invitation of this body so that they may be represented here, we had better not consider them.

Bishop Atkins: Without anticipating the remarks I desire to make to-morrow, I think we are a little late in taking up

the consideration of this branch of the subject. We have delayed altogether too long, and I am sorry that the order was so constructed as to bring the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church into this discussion on the subject of unification. Now that the question has been proposed, I want to say that economically, all other considerations laid aside, participation with this Commission on the part of the Colored Methodist Church and other colored Churches will be of vast advantage to us when we go to our General Conferences. We know the suggestion they gave to us and we know the meaning of those terms and I do not think there was any disagreement on that subject. They recommended—they requested that we take up the question of the union of the various colored Churches of the South, and we ought to have had these men here with us from the start, but we did not know the direction this meeting would take. The truth is, we have just arrived at what we have been calling the crux; but the trouble now is, we are proposing wider range than we heretofore expected to take, which I think is wise on our part. The very fact that we are brought into that situation brings up the question as to these others, and I say again that if we will take proper steps here with reference to the future work with those men it will economically strengthen any report that the representatives of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, take to their Conference.

E. B. Chappell: Collections are taken up in all our churches for the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church.

Frank M. Thomas: We can claim as much organically on that subject as you, and we had better face it when it comes to the preferential report or we shall run against a greater trouble. We talk about a nation-wide or a world-wide Church. Yet we find here a disinclination even to attempt to get the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church and these other distinctively negro Churches into this reorganized Church. Now, we have before us a broad question that we have to deal with, and that is, What are we going to do and how are we to deport ourselves with reference to this vast negro race not represented in the membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church? I think we had better take this up at some time during this conference providing for a future relationship with all those negroes and then go back with that to the General Conference.

W. N. Ainsworth: I make the point that our time has expired.

The Chairman (Bishop McDowell): The point of order is made that we are adjourned by limitation of time. By common consent we may remain until the completion of this business. Is there common consent?

Frank M. Thomas: I have been the keeper of the official records since the beginning of the proceedings at Baltimore ten years ago. One of the first matters to come up, and it was brought to the attention of the Southern Commissioners by your Commissioners, was the gathering together of the colored Methodists of America into one body, and upon the basis of that the report of suggestions was finally adopted and in that it says:

We suggest that the colored membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Protestant Church, and such other organizations of colored Methodists as may enter into agreement with them, may be constituted and recognized as one of the Quadrennial or Jurisdictional Conferences of the proposed reorganization.

The point I made was this: that, in view of the fact that there are in the South not only the C. M. E. Church closely related to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, but other branches of colored Methodists who may want to come into this reorganized Church if the plans under consideration work out, this committee appointed should take into consideration the matter of devising some method by which these Churches might come in if they so desired.

Bishop Hamilton: I have no objection in the world to the general desire expressed; but I do not think at this time, so late at night, when we have before us two reports and an amendment in which there is involved the possibility of all these brethren coming in before the five years expire, that the matter should be put to a vote now. I would like to think a little on this matter and not vote until later.

Frank M. Thomas: It is suggested to refer to this Joint Committee that has been appointed.

Bishop Hamilton: I ask, Can that not rest until we come tomorrow morning?

The Chairman (Bishop McDowell): You have heard the motion of Dr. Thomas. What is your pleasure?

R. E. Jones: I do not like to do it, but I rise to a parliamentary point and inquire if this Commission is competent to do such a thing? This is a Joint Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. The other bodies are distinct organizations; and, sustaining as I do close friendly relations with these men, I would not be true to them nor true to my own convictions if I did not raise the question whether this body is competent to pass such a motion.

The Chairman (Bishop McDowell): If a ruling of the Chair is asked, I shall be obliged to rule that in the form of Dr. Thomas's motion there is no parliamentary impropriety.

A vote being taken, the motion of Rev. Frank M. Thomas was adopted.

"Praise God, from whom all blessings flow" was sung and the session was dismissed with benediction by Rev. Joseph W Van Cleve.

EIGHTH DAY, THURSDAY, JANUARY 31, 1918.

MORNING SESSION.

The Joint Commission met pursuant to adjournment, Bishop McDowell in the chair, at 9:30 A.M.

The hymn, "O Happy Day," was sung.

Prayer was offered by Dr. Watkins, and also by Bishop Leete.

Bishop McDowell read Psalm cxxii.

The roll was called and the following were present: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke, Collins Denny, Edwin D. Mouzon, W. B. Murrah, James Atkins. Ministers: Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, Edwin M. Randall, Claudius B. Spencer, Joseph W. Van Cleve, John J. Wallace, F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, John M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. DuBose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar; C. M. Stuart, alternate. Laymen: G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, Alex. Simpson, Jr., R. V. Watt, James R. Joy, Charles A. Pollock.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Before you take up the regular day's business may I make a report from the Committee of Eight? The probabilities are that that committee will agree upon its report unanimously. We want to put that report, whenever agreed upon, in printed form, so that there will be a copy for each member, and it will not be possible to do that before three o'clock. Therefore, on behalf of the committee, I request that we may be excused from attendance at the morning session so that we can finish that report and that we have leave to have it printed.

On motion duly made and seconded, the request was granted.

The journal of yesterday afternoon was read and approved.

Bishop Earl Cranston took the chair as presiding officer.

F. M. Thomas: I move that while the committee is out we take up the report on the Judicial Council.

The motion was seconded.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Is not that disposed of?

Frank M. Thomas: No, sir.

David G. Downey: I think it would be rather unwise to take up so important a matter with so many of our brethren away from the meeting. I think it is also probable that this report

will be affected by the report that the absent committee may bring in. I sympathize with the desire to get forward, but I wonder if we shall make progress if we attempt to do anything until we hear this report.

Rolla V. Watt: I call attention to the fact that the report was practically adopted at the last meeting with the exception of the one section. That section had been adopted and on Dr. Blake's motion the vote by which it was adopted was reconsidered and that section was referred back to the committee. The thing that Dr. Blake objected to was Mr. Simpson's wording of that clause. Both Dr. Blake and Mr. Simpson are on the committee which is now out, and it would be unwise to settle the matter in the absence of both of these gentlemen. Therefore, I hope the motion to take up that report will not be carried.

Bishop Cooke: That is precisely as Brother Watt states. I have lost the thread of the matter. We broke off at the end and took up, by special order, the other subject. I wish the Secretary could go back to the minutes and tell what was referred to my committee. It was referred back to the committee and the committee has not concluded its labor.

Frank M. Thomas: In view of that, I will withdraw the motion. I would like to ask if the Committee on General Reference has anything to report.

Bishop Mouzoni: The Committee on General Reference has had one meeting. It is entirely impossible for that committee to present a report until these other reports shall come in. There might be some informal things we might do. It will be remembered that to this committee was referred the subject of the contents of the constitution and we could debate that a long time. The name of the new Church and also the terms of the membership are matters that might be discussed now. But, I repeat, it will be impossible for the committee to frame any report until other committees shall have brought in their reports.

David G. Downey: A question of privilege of the house. Dr. Van Cleve has had to go away and Dr. Charles M. Stuart is present, and I move that he be seated in place of Dr. Van Cleve.

The motion was seconded.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Secretary will simply announce that Dr. Stuart will take the place of Dr. Van Cleve. That was the understanding with the Commission yesterday. The Commission does not have to vote on the seating of any one.

Claudius B. Spencer: Are we under miscellaneous business?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): No, but unless there is objection you can go ahead.

There was no objection.

Claudius B. Spencer: It is quite likely that the matter might have been more justly presented by another, but it occurs to me in this moment, when we have a little breathing space, that these gentlemen of the Commission ought to send some kind of message to the President of the United States. One of the first things done after the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church was to convey the sentiments of Methodism to President Washington, and I have the thought that it would be most fitting if we, who are charged with the responsibility, would instruct the two Chairmen in this Joint Commission to frame something according to their judgment and forward it to the President of the United States, and I so move.

The motion was seconded.

Secretary Harris: That paper is to be forwarded after the successful conclusion of our labors?

Claudius B. Spencer: Yes.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): After we have something to communicate.

A vote being taken, the motion was carried.

Secretary Harris read telegrams, one addressed to Bishop McDowell and one to Bishop Cranston, signed by James S. Montgomery and Ira E. Robinson.

Bishop Mouzon: I suggest, as there seems to be nothing of greater importance before us just now, in order that we may have an idea as to the consensus of opinion touching these matters, that we take up the discussion of the name of the reorganized Church and the condition of membership in the reorganized Church. And I so move.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Has the committee adopted any name?

Bishop Mouzon: No, the committee has not adopted any name. The committee has waited to get the views of the Commission before bringing anything in.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Bishop Mouzon, will you kindly tell us what names have been suggested?

Bishop Mouzon: Dr. Randall is Secretary of the committee. There has been one suggestion in my mind.

Rolla V. Watt: Did I not hand you in a copy of some minutes which gave all of that in detail?

Edwin M. Randall: Yes, but I did not apprehend that any-

thing of this kind would come in, and I have not made any translation.

Rolla V. Watt: They didn't require any translation; they are in plain English.

Bishop Mouzon: Brother Watt was temporarily Secretary and he has a speech he desires to make on this. I suggest that we hear him.

Frank M. Thomas: The matter is before you in the action of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; and that committee states at the close of its action at Oklahoma City that the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, are instructed to say to the Joint Commission on Unification that the name preferred is "The Methodist Church in America."

Abram W. Harris: I want to ask Dr. Thomas what that action was and by whom taken.

Frank M. Thomas: By the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at its last meeting.

Abram W. Harris: It was not a part of the action transmitted.

Frank M. Thomas: Yes, part of our instruction. You will find it on page 37 of the Baltimore proceedings.

David G. Downey: Your instructions were simply to say that that was your preference.

E. C. Reeves: Was that name to be The Methodist Church or The Methodist Episcopal, or what?

Frank M. Thomas: The Methodist Church in America.

E. C. Reeves: I don't like that.

Rolla V. Watt: I have no speech on the subject. I was Secretary *pro tem.* of the committee and passed the minutes of what we did in the committee to Dr. Randall. Everything we did at the meeting of the committee was informal. Our Chairman, Bishop Mouzon, notified the men of their appointments, and after a little while it was suggested that we informally find out the opinions of the gentlemen present as to what the name of the reorganized Church should be. The result of this informal expression of opinion was that eight out of eleven were in favor of the name The Methodist Episcopal Church. Two favored either The Methodist Church or The Methodist Episcopal Church, caring not the difference of a penny which, and one preferred The Episcopal Methodist Church. I am inclined to believe that one of the two who were for either The Methodist Church or The Methodist Episcopal Church, preferred The Methodist Church and possibly The Methodist Church in America. There was a good deal of discussion and it was not very formal. Bishop Leete made a suggestion that I think rather appealed to all of us—namely, that the name of the Church should be The

Methodist Episcopal Church, but that the name of the country in which it is operating should be added. To illustrate: The Methodist Episcopal Church in America, The Methodist Episcopal Church in China, The Methodist Episcopal Church in India, etc., and that this be constitutionally provided for. It seemed that the logical addition of the name of the country in which the Church is operating would add strength and might meet other requirements. Of course, it was pointed out that neither Church would want to appear to be swallowed by the other. Nevertheless, the committee felt that, since we will be all one Church and have all been Methodist Episcopal, it would not be wise to hunt a new name. It was also felt that the name, The Methodist Episcopal Church in America, is too narrow to apply to the whole Church, especially in foreign lands. The meeting, as I have said, was most informal, and it was rather a surprise to all of us that eight out of eleven voted for the name "The Methodist Episcopal Church" on the first call and without discussion.

Charles A. Pollock: In order to get something before the house, I move that we recommend that the name of the new Church be "The United Methodist Episcopal Church."

The motion was seconded.

Bishop Atkins: I move as a substitute that the name be "The Episcopal Methodist Church" and nothing else.

The motion was seconded.

Bishop Atkins: I do this for two reasons: The first is that there is enough difference in the form to advertise to the public that a change has been made in our relations, but more especially for the reason that when the Church was named Episcopal the episcopacy was the big thing and the Methodist was a mere incident. Now "Methodist" is the main thing and "Episcopal" more of an incident. Putting "Episcopal" at the first would designate the form of government and distinguish it from forms not being Episcopal, and Methodist, being the main thing, deserves that kind of prominence, and I think Episcopal Methodist Church, with Bishop Leete's suggestion to add the country, would be an absolutely accurate designation in accordance with history and facts, and I think it makes a very beautiful name.

Abram W. Harris: I think we will make progress, and I move to substitute, for all now before us, that in the sense of this Commission the name of the reorganized Church should include the word "Episcopal."

The motion was seconded.

E. C. Reeves: I reckon I'm an old-timer.

Rolla V. Watt: You doubtless are.

E. C. Reeves: But I know of but one case where the child

was named before it was born. I know of one child who was named William Robinson before it was born, and then it was born a girl. Now, I don't want anything in the name of the reorganized Church to remind us that we were ever divided. I don't want to drop off the "Methodist" or the "Episcopal," and neither do I want to put in "America," but just simply to say the Methodist Episcopal Church, and we are and we will be the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Abram W. Harris: I agree with you absolutely; but I think we may get to the end of part of our journey if we take one step at a time and not attempt to cover them all at once.

Bishop Mouzon: I am aware that a number of people believe that the name "Episcopal Methodist Church" would be a very fitting name for the reorganized Church. It will be remembered that the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, which met in the city of New Orleans in 1866, which was indeed a memorable General Conference, adopted the name, "The Episcopal Methodist Church." A while back, I was in the city of New Orleans. I went to the office of the *Picayune* and searched through the files of the daily papers of that period, and I was interested to notice the press announcement, "The General Conference of the Episcopal Methodist Church adjourned to-day." But the Annual Conferences refused to give the required majority, and that name failed of adoption. I could never feel at home living in a Church with that name, "Episcopal Methodist Church." The fact is, I have been standing on my feet all my life, and to be standing on my head the rest of my days would be uncomfortable. I do not want to be turned upside down, so I shall certainly vote against any such name as that. I stand ready to vote for Dr. Harris's motion that the name of the Church shall include the word "Episcopal." Certainly it should do that, because we are Episcopalians, and we have always been Episcopalians. I was holding an Annual Conference a while back, and the rector of the Protestant Episcopal Church made the address of welcome. He said some things that were wise and a number of things that were not wise, and among the things that were not wise he spoke of the wonderful growth of the "daughter" of the Protestant Episcopal Church. I never say "Episcopal Church"; I always say "Protestant Episcopal Church."

John F. Goucher: I always say "Roman Catholic Episcopal Church."

Bishop Mouzon: I reminded that rector that the "daughter" was older than the "mother," that the Methodist Episcopal Church in America was organized before the Protestant Episcopal Church and that we were not under the necessity of going

in a roundabout way to do it, and did not have to ask the English Parliament to permit us to organize in this country. I have always held that the American Episcopal Church is the Methodist Episcopal Church in America. I might say some other things just here, but I am not going to say anything more bearing on that. The first Episcopal Church organized in America was the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, and it ought always to be understood that we are an Episcopal Church. Is any Church "Episcopal" except in the matter of Church government?

Frank M. Thomas: Oh, yes.

Bishop Mouzon: It would be interesting to hear the question discussed, or it might not be interesting as the case may be, but I certainly hope that when we do name the Church the word "Episcopal" will find a place in that name. Now, my modest friend Mr. Simpson, who has been sitting here silent all this time, says that in his home town on a certain occasion they had a baby named two days before it was born. That is somewhat amusing. We ought, nevertheless, to consider the name of the Church we are going to have by and by, and for myself I prefer the name "Methodist Episcopal Church." Why do I prefer that? I have only a small experience in the mission field, but I did discover when I was in Mexico that there was a great movement in the Church in the direction of nationalism. When I was in South America, I found the same thing there. Now, if we say "Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States," that is not just what we want. If we say "Methodist Episcopal Church in America," that is not just what we want. But, if we say "Methodist Episcopal Church," then one in Mexico will feel at home in that communion; and one in Brazil, and one in Argentina, and one in India, and one in China. In whatsoever land men may live they will feel at home in a Church whose name carries no suggestion of geographical or national limitations.

Bishop Leete: I think, myself, "a rose by any other name would smell as sweet." It does not occur to me that the most significant matter before us will be the name. I do not feel that this is the hour when great destinies are swung into existence or out of existence. As far as I am concerned, I am willing to go with almost any reasonable name. But I have this feeling: I think we are wise to keep as close as possible to history. I think that episcopacy goes into the situation and the history in such a way that we have to consider it. I would not personally object to Episcopal Methodist Church or Methodist Episcopal Church, and I would not seriously object to Methodist Church, though I really think there is a sense in which the

historicity and the central idea of episcopacy may well be conserved. But I believe we ought to make some provision in connection with this name for growing nationalism, and for the difficulties of management, locally, in various countries where the Church is represented. My own feeling is that we ought to have a permissive arrangement, not an obligatory one, by which our people operating in another country than ours, whatever that country may be, shall be entitled, if it be desirable for good reasons,† to apply the name of the country where the body is found, in addition to the regular name of the Church. I feel that would be a wise provision for the great future. I feel we will get on faster in other countries if we give them a little of the nomenclature and a certain national relationship to their own land in the name we adopt. When the opportunity arises—I think we are now under the general notion of episcopacy—if someone else does not do it, I will move that whenever it seems desirable for any wise reasons, our people in other regions than the United States shall be permitted to add to the designation of the Church some name indicating the locality in which those people are operating.

Charles M. Stuart: With the permission of the General Conference.

Bishop Leete: Make it permissive, and not mandatory, and that will solve some of the difficulties in lands with whose problems we have been wrestling.

Claudius B. Spencer: I hope we shall not feel moved to pull down the ensign under which Methodism has won her historic triumphs. When we are again one, around the same communion table, and we remember our unpleasantness only as memories that, like the shades, make the landscape brighter, I hope we shall have the same name, that we shall not need to put a new name on the door plate, and that we will not allow the colored Church alone to bear our historic name. Thomas Ware, who was a member of the Christmas Conference in 1784, wrote afterwards that Dr. Coke was in favor of taking the name Methodist Episcopal Church. The motion to adopt the name "Methodist Episcopal Church" was made by John Dickens, the first publishing agent of our joint Book Concern; and I have reason to believe that he made that motion after ample consultation with both Coke and Asbury. Moreover, there are some reasons which make one feel that those identical words may have been known to Wesley himself. That, I cannot stress, however, but the name Methodist Episcopal Church is our common name, yours and ours, the name that Bishop McTyeire, in his very fascinating history, has undertaken to make plain is the property of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, as well as our own. He de-

clared that the Methodist Episcopal Church was improperly using language in applying to ourselves except, as he expressed it, as the name included such a part of the Methodist Church as was not included in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in Memphis, came near restoring the original name. I think a majority vote of the General Conference in Memphis would have been sufficient to make over the technical name of Methodist Episcopal Church, South, into "Methodist Episcopal Church in America." As I stand here there passes before my mind the long list of the names of the men who have made Methodism so puissant throughout the earth, not only amongst ourselves, but just now, particularly those wonderful leaders who have sprung up on Southern soil. It seems to me it would be an offense to discard that name under which they all wrought side by side when the Church was one. What can we possibly put in its place? Who shall bear the name if we do not? I took pains to look the matter up the other day. It is the title of the Church; it stands in the charters of all our great enterprises, the Book Concern, our benevolences, our chartered fund; the charters simply say "Methodist Episcopal Church." Possibly there may be some sentimental reason why some good men in the Southland would object to this name, feeling that there is some concession in it. But is not sentiment really amongst all of us in its favor? It can but be, if we wish to walk together again in the old paths in the old unity. I hope that no position of opposition will be taken. I hope that the position taken by Bishops McTyeire and Tigert will be taken instead. We of the North have nothing but appreciation for the long list of your noble men who have done such valiant service both when we were one and since. Neither we nor you ought to pull down the old ensign they had and bury it away. For their sake, for the sake of its international prestige, and for the sake of the reunited family kneeling around the common altar let us have that name. Let us not allow the colored Methodist Churches of this land to be the only bodies that will hand down to posterity the name under which our world-wide victories have been won.

Albert J. Nast: It is delightful to get out of the great jungle of differences and get into these delightful oases where there is no great difference in opinion. This matter interests me. I happen to be on the Committee on General Reference. It was most remarkable and we were all surprised to find a practical unanimity on the name when an informal vote was taken by asking each one in succession to state his preference. I appreciate greatly also, though it is not just parliamentary for me to bring it into the subject, that which the Bishop has mentioned. Yet it has a

very important bearing on the whole question. We are to speak on the motion of Dr. Harris, I suppose, as to including the word "Episcopal" in the name of the new Church; but, if I may be permitted, I would like in a moment to branch off into the other, wider field a little. It so happens that the translation of the name "The Methodist Episcopal Church" in our German Discipline reverses the order. It is: "*Die Bischoefliche Methodistenkirche.*" The reason for that is that to have written the name "Methodist Episcopal Church" in the same order in German would have been exceedingly awkward, and, moreover, would have placed the emphasis on Episcopalianism. It would have gone something like this: "*Die methodistische Episkopal-Kirche.*" So, although we have not followed the exact order of the words in the English original, we have been in perfect accord with the spirit of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this translation, which is the main thing to be considered. As to the main influence of our Church, as a world Church, it is of great importance that the name be such as will be adapted to our work anywhere in the world. May I here read an extract from a letter received not very long ago from Bishop Nuelson concerning the awful catastrophe that has overtaken that part of the world? This is at the close of a letter which was written to Dr. F. M. North, Secretary of our Board of Foreign Missions. Bishop Nuelson says: "I have reason to expect a decided change in the attitude of the Church and State leaders in Protestant countries toward the free Churches. In the beginning of the war it seemed as though the idea of a National Church had become all-absorbing. Now, the feeling has become the reverse, and a new alignment is taking place. The present ground is against the State-Church idea. Again the value of international Church relations is getting to be more appreciated, at least by the far-seeing leaders. To sum it up, it is my deliberate judgment that the work of Methodism in Europe is really just beginning." Now, if we have a name as simple and comprehensive as "The Methodist Episcopal Church," which can be adapted to every country on the face of the globe, I think it will be wise.

John F. Goucher: I wish to support the motion of Dr. Harris that the name of the reorganized Church shall include the word "Episcopal." I would like to go still further and support the suggestion of Bishop Mouzon that the name shall be The Methodist Episcopal Church. I do that for a variety of reasons. Let me mention one or two: There is a Church assuming to call itself, outside of the United States, The Church of America. It is advertising itself on its buildings, in the guidebooks, and in every way it can as The Church of America. That is very affected in people of Christian faith, and we are wise, I think, in cutting off

the word "America." I know that there are those who hold the attitude suggested by the one who has just spoken, that the official title is the Methodist Episcopal Church—that that has been a matter of argument and that a good deal has been brought forth to support the contention that it is the Episcopal Methodist Church. If that is so, it should be changed, because it so overflows its borders as to be no more the Methodist Episcopal Church in America. America is no longer able to hold the Methodists. Methodism is going into all lands. But for these and other reasons, I think it would be wise to cut off the "America" and call it only "The Methodist Episcopal Church." We are, and we would be, The Methodist Episcopal Church. I do not like the idea of cutting out the word "Episcopal," for then we would have it The Methodist Church, and there are other Methodist Churches, and that would put us in the same position to be criticized as this other Church that calls itself The Christian Church of America.

Frank M. Thomas: No one has spoken as yet in favor of the name preferred by the General Conference of my Church. I do not wish it to be dismissed so lightly, for the thought in this reorganization was that we should look at everything from the beginning, and form a new Church for a new day, and I am going to submit to you that we are failing to draw a distinction between the name and definition. The name is a sign and, of course, is necessary; but a definition is also essential. If you are going to define this reorganized Church, you should not leave out one of its essential elements. I submit to you, gentlemen, that the Methodist Church from which we come was presbyterial before it was episcopal; I submit to you that the presbyterial idea is as much an integral part of the Methodist Church as the episcopal idea, and there would be about forty bishops in the reorganized Church to start with. There are over thirty thousand presbyters, and I submit that the presbyter is as vital, perhaps not as important—but I submit that the presbyter is just as vital a part as the episcopal. Now, don't misunderstand me. I want to say very frankly that with much of the outcry against the episcopacy that we hear in this democratic world I have no sympathy. In fact, I fear that we do not realize how important the episcopacy is to our system and to the carrying on of the vital life of the Church amidst the changing lights of the century. I am not a High-Churchman by any means. I am temperamentally a Kentuckian, and at times I find myself in that frame of mind in which I once heard a Kentuckian speak. He said: "Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the resolution is, but whatever the resolution is I'm agin it." I think that is the common frame of mind of many Kentuckians and East Tennesseans. I

wish to say more and more that you must have centers that cannot change, you must have men in whom inhere the very life of the Church, and this life must be stable. I know nothing better to be found in Church life than our episcopal system, duly guarded; but you haven't any trace of episcopacy in the first Christian Church. I defy you to find it. The men in the Protestant Episcopal Church have searched for it, have failed to find it, and have confessed their failure. But you will find the presbyterial element there. I have sometimes thought that if we got big enough to invest our laity with some of the dignity the Presbyterian Church gives to its elders, we could better stabilize our laity. But that is not the point. If you want to put a definition instead of a name, you must put in "Presbyterian." If we are going to give it a name that will signify what it is to the whole world, and will not recall any bitterness, the very best thing for the Methodist Church would be—if Judge Pollock will permit me to take one adjective from his very fine statement—the best thing would be to call it "The United Methodist Church." We are primarily Methodists. We were Methodists before John Wesley gave to us the episcopal form of superintendency in America. But, brethren, the day might come—I hope it will not—but the day might come when we would lose our episcopal form of government. We cannot tell what changes will be brought forth, but Methodism will abide, because Methodism is founded in Christian experience; and if you are going to give it a name which would include episcopacy, then you should put in the word "Presbyterial," which has just as much right there in the name as any word representing episcopacy. But if you are going to give it a name, give it a name that signifies before God and man the very thing that Methodism stands for, and that is Christian experience. I have been asked by a number of intelligent men since I have been here, and I have been surprised at it, if there is a call to-day for personal experience as there once was, whether the emphasis ought not more and more to be translated into social life. I want to say, whenever Methodism gets away from that concrete personal communion with God, it has gone; and if we are to give it a name, let it be the United Methodist Church, and all the world will understand what you mean. If we are going to try to carry to the minds of the masses a concept of what we are, we have to widen our definition. We are Methodists first, last, and all the time. The world knows what we mean by Methodists. The devil knows what we mean by Methodists. The time may come when the present meaning of the bishopric shall be lost in change. (We do not always know what we mean by a bishop.) You remember when Dr. McTyeire ceased to be an editor and was elected a bishop, one old

Methodist said: "What became of Dr. McTyeire? I used to enjoy his paper very much." The presiding elder said, "Didn't you know that they had elected him a bishop?" and the old man said: "Now, that is where I lost him." So, if you want to define the word, do it; but if you want to name the Church, give it the name "Methodist." All the world knows what "Methodist" stands for: a definite personal experience with God. When my regiment came up from Cuba at the close of the Spanish-American war, they put us on a wind-swept island down at the mouth of the Savannah River. It was the most trying experience I ever had. I was half starved and half frozen and altogether uncomfortable. On Sunday afternoon there was a wild storm blowing, the ocean was mad and raging, I walked along the beach with a Quartermaster General of the United States Army, and as we wandered along listening to the mad waves and looking at the lowering clouds, we got to talking about religion, and finally he said: "Chaplain, to what Church do you belong?" I said, "I am a Methodist, I am pleased to tell you." He looked at me, tears came into his eyes, and he said: "I'm glad to meet you. I am a Moravian." The night was coming on, the waves were wild, and we looked across at Tybee light, where John Wesley, a presbyter of the Church of England, lighted a flame of experience that swept across the world. So now I say, let the world know that we are the United Methodist Church.

Bishop Cooke: I do not suppose that our Secretary intended to cross the judgment of the founder of Methodism concerning the episcopacy in the New Testament. There has been a great deal of misconception about the whole matter, even among ourselves. If you will turn to the minutes of the British Conference held in Bristol, I think it was in 1785, you will find this question and answer by Wesley, who was firm in his judgment as to the accuracy of Chancellor King's book. The question is, "Do we find the three orders, deacons, presbyters, and bishops in the New Testament?" And Mr. Wesley's reply was, "They are there described, but not prescribed." He recognized the fact that episcopacy was there. Mr. Wesley himself always recognized the fact of the episcopacy of the Church of God. His argument for ordaining Coke, being himself a presbyter, was drawn from the fact that the presbyters at Alexandria ordained one of their number to be a bishop. I am heartily in favor of this name, The Methodist Episcopal Church. The first part of it describes our doctrine, our theology, and including the experience of the people called Methodists. It is Methodist in doctrine. Everybody who knows anything about the Church knows the content of the word "Methodist" historically,

theologically, and experimentally. Then we are an episcopal body. We have, from the very beginning, been such. The founders of Methodism in the Conference of 1784 said that, being satisfied with the validity of their personal orders, we form ourselves into an independent Church calling ourselves The Methodist Episcopal Church. These are the facts, and these are the facts that the Protestant Episcopal Church does not like for us to affirm. They are all the time talking about their episcopacy and their being the American Church. We are the successors of the Church of England. The simple fact is, no man could be a preacher in Methodism in this country at the beginning unless he pledged himself loyal to the Church, and that which was meant by the Church was the Established Church then existing in the Colonies. He had to pledge himself, so that we are all successors, if there are any in the world, of the Episcopal Church. Now, I am not in favor of the name Methodist Episcopal Church of America. The words "of America" are wholly unnecessary. It limits us to America. I think we should wisely leave off the genitive of quality. In the New Testament it is never the Church of Rome or of Corinth. It is always the dative of the place in which: "The church which is in Corinth, the church in Ephesus." It was never in the conception of the apostles to limit the Church of God. It was destined at the very beginning, because it was a Church of God emanating from Him, to be a universal Church. Methodism is not limited to any one place. It is destined in its very nature and essential character to become a universal Church, because the doctrine we preach is thus adapted, the experience we possess is universal. So, when we consider it historically, theologically, or otherwise, we find ourselves describing our doctrine as Methodist and our form of government as Episcopal, and we leave it just there so that any nation can apply to that Church the name of that nation. It may be the Methodist Episcopal Church in Japan, or the Methodist Episcopal Church in Switzerland, or anywhere else in the world. Under that banner we can all rally; and when we think of the fathers of Methodism, of the blessed, heroic men who sowed the seed throughout the length and breadth of this country, we can enshrine their memories in our hearts and place on their tombstones "Methodist Episcopal Church."

Bishop McDowell: We have really two questions here: one is the question of whether we shall put into our title any geographical suggestion of any sort, and the other is whether we shall put into our title a suggestion that will define in any way our policy. Referring to the first question, it seems that we would do well to remember that we are not proposing geographical

limitations for this great Church. We have not altogether escaped embarrassment at times in our General Conference, and I should be surprised if our brethren had escaped embarrassment in their General Conference, in consequence of the disposition to treat the General Conference as though it were an American body altogether. When, for example, we were shouting at Minneapolis over the organization of the Republic of China, we made much ado about republics, as though a republic constituted the only kind of government there might possibly be in the world. But I think if I had been there from Sweden or Italy or Germany or Japan, I would have been disposed to feel that I was in the wrong pew. I think, therefore, that in our broad corporate title we should eliminate every geographical allusion. I am bound to say that I would be rather sorry to see the word "United" come into the title, because that would embalm in the title the long historic separation which I think would be very unfortunate. That is by way of parenthesis. I think, if we are the Methodist Episcopal Church or the Methodist Church, that our brethren, wherever they are, under whatever flag, will feel that they have their full, perfect, and sufficient rights and standing. Now, as to whether we shall put into our title an effort to define a particular part of our policy or of our system of government and its administration, that is another question. There, again, we should remember what Dr. Thomas has just suggested: if you are going to make it a title fully descriptive, you will make it impossible as a title. It is true that we are an episcopal Church. It is also true that we are an Arminian Church. That would distinguish us from the Calvinists just as the other would distinguish us from the independent Churches. But we are an itinerant Church as far as our ministry is concerned also, and we are a whole lot of things that we do not feel obliged to speak of every time we refer to the Methodist Church. I have a little complaint against my parents. They thought they were doing a lovely thing for me when they gave me all of my grandfather's name to carry through life. They called me William Fraser, because that was the name of my mother's father. I wish many times that they had been wise enough to let me have just a part of it and leave off the rest of it. I have to do entirely too much signing, and the signature is entirely too long. At the Annual Conferences, I am obliged to make out my certificates of ordination, and I have to start off, "I, William Fraser McDowell, one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church," etc., and then at the end I sign "William Fraser McDowell," and I get very tired of writing that name, and I wish I could have had the name John Doe. But aside from that there is a pretty good philosophy in giv-

ing to a body like ours a name by which it will be called in common speech. You are called the Methodist Church all through the Southern country, and we are called the Methodist Church all through the Northern country, and wherever else we are. When Chaplain Thomas said to that General, "I am a Methodist," he didn't feel obliged to say: "I am a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South." When people speak to me about the Church to which I belong, I say, usually, that I am a Methodist. That is a pretty good plain name for good plain people. That harmonizes with their common usage and practice. It may save a little confusion. Bishop Mouzon was just saying that occasionally members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, sell property to the Methodist Episcopal Church and get the names all mixed, and I do not suppose there is any doubt that you have got many legacies that were intended for us, and I do not want that thing to keep on happening! But if I were making a will I would like to have it just as difficult as possible for my will to be broken afterwards, and just as easy as possible to know just exactly the title of this institution that I wanted to give something to. But you say that if people are going to leave money they ought to be careful enough to look it up. But often, in the back countries when they want to leave money and want to know the title of the Church, there is not any document within reach that will tell them. I think many wills are made leaving property to the Methodist Church, and that ought to settle it. I beg pardon for even suggesting that, because that is such a legal question that my non-legal mind has no right to be thinking of it; but since I have mentioned it, I hope somebody will clear it up. There is another reason why, in my judgment, the name proposed by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is the better name. We are wanting, are we not, a union with the Methodist Protestant Church? I do not agree at all with the practice or contention of the Methodist Protestant Church as to administration. I am not one of those who think that we have at all come to their historic position in the years of our practice; but if we are wanting a union with the Methodist Protestant Church, I think we would do well not to put into our title a name that would be pretty nearly prohibitive. It certainly would be prohibitive to me if I were a Methodist Protestant.

Frank M. Thomas: They practically stated that to us.

Bishop McDowell: I do not think that we are proposing to move along that line. We ought to move in the line of largest possible adjustment to the most of those with whom we seek relations. It is quite possible that such bodies as the United Brethren would feel that they could come into the Methodist Church

and would not feel that they could come into the Methodist Episcopal Church. Now, hark back a moment to that use of the word Episcopal. I know the full force and value of what has been suggested by Dr. Goucher and others with reference to the issue between ourselves and the Protestant Episcopalians. Brethren, I suppose I have as much regard for the episcopacy as any man ought to have; but if I thought that in these years that lie ahead of us questions like that were going to have a large and commanding influence among people of real depth of thinking, I should be genuinely discouraged. I know that they will be disposed to make light of it. You are right about that, but they have always been disposed to make light of us and they will lead away a good many of a certain type of people, just as they do by printed prayers. There is a certain stage of development, when a mind thinks its own superiority is proved by its admiration of liturgy. Now, I am not afraid of written prayers. I am somewhat ritualistic. I would rather say the Lord's Prayer than any prayer of my own. I repeat over and over again that one collect, "Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires are known, and from whom no secrets are hid," not because it is a printed prayer, not because it is in the ritual, but because it lays bare my heart before Almighty God and tells him what I want. We cannot put into a title all those provisions that will meet all the sentiment and all the likings and all the dislikings of all the multitude. I do not want to say over again anything that I have already said; but the world to which we are coming pretty rapidly will not be the old world through which we have passed, but a new world. Those people in the trenches and a lot of people at home are going to require of us not that we exhibit and emphasize our verbal refinements—they are going to require of us a new note of reality or they will pass us by. The men who have been in hell together in the trenches are going to require such preaching of the gospel of Christ as people under conventional circumstances have not found necessary. Now, you may think this is a considerable talk for a man who is in the episcopal office. Brethren, the episcopal office, from my point of view—shall I say it as reverently as I can?—is not a thing to be held on to and grasped at as though it were a prize that one could not let go in any way. The episcopal office, from my point of view and out of my experience, is that place in which the last reach of consecration to Jesus Christ and humanity is called for. When we are referred to once and a while as the chief ministers of the Church, when we are referred to as the chief pastors and shepherds of the flock, I know where the emphasis lies. Some lay emphasis upon the "chief," but always in my heart I try to lay the emphasis the other way, chief MIN-

ISTER, chief SHEPHERD, chief PASTOR, chief SERVANT of the Church of God, and it is because of that conception of the episcopacy that I am not at all careful to have the word "Episcopal" stuck into the title or held in the title. For a lot of things that were once valuable for controversial, or what you may call fighting, reasons have ceased to be valuable. Therefore, I would be perfectly happy to have the Church known as the Methodist Church, and I should speak of it not as the Methodist Church in America, not as the Methodist Church in China, but I should think of it, as I try to think of everything, as the Methodist Church in the kingdom of God for which Christ Jesus died, in the kingdom, in the world, which this Methodist Church must everywhere help to bring to him.

E. C. Reeves: Mr. Chairman, I wish to go on record as favoring these words which were written out before Bishop Cooke made his speech, which goes to prove that sometimes great minds run in the same channel, almost precisely.

Bishop Hamilton: Thank you, we are very glad to hear that, of course.

E. C. Reeves: Here are my words: "There are no other words under heaven that can express all we mean to stand for and nothing better than the four words 'The Methodist Episcopal Church.'" That name includes all and nothing more. It means we are Methodists. It means we are Episcopal in polity. It says we are a Church, and we know and the world knows that means a Christian Church. That spells all: nothing more, nothing less.

Frank M. Thomas: I rise to a question of personal privilege. While I was speaking there was a subconscious movement in my mind that there was a United Methodist Church somewhere in the world, and I find there is, and I would like to correct my speech and drop out that reference to "United."

Bishop Cranston: Is there a "Methodist Church in the United States"?

Frank M. Thomas: No.

C. W. Kinne: I thought there was.

A. F. Watkins: Ever since I began thinking about it at all, I have regretted that the word "Episcopal" was in our Church name, and in explaining that I propose to go back to John Wesley himself. You know John Wesley gave us, as we believe, our form of government in its main details. I believed that myself. I mean that he meant that we should have a "general superintendency." And I want it understood that I am a thorough believer in our form of government and in our general superintendency; but John Wesley did not want our general superintendents to be called bishops. He wanted the THING, not the

NAME. He wanted a general superintendent, and believed that so far as the New Testament teaching was concerned he could make just as good a bishop as anybody. I think there was a very profound reason why he did not want the general superintendents called bishops. John Wesley knew that there is no greater mistake than in saying there is nothing in a name. I would not like a rose as well if you would call it a stink cabbage. There is something in a name. John Wesley knew that the word "bishop" had a historic flavor, that had been gathered through the centuries, that he did not want to attach to the general superintendency of the Methodist Church in America. He wanted that office, he wanted that function in the Church, but for centuries the word "episcopal" had carried with it the prelatical significance and John Wesley wanted to get rid of that prelatical idea. Brethren, we had just as well admit that in the Church, historically speaking, the prelacy has not had altogether an admirable record. It has stood for everything that Methodism does not stand for, for church privileges, for sacerdotalism, for all the things that are contrary to that spirit of fine reality that Bishop McDowell spoke about a while ago, and that open access to God that every man has, a universal priesthood that brings all who love Christ upon a common level and gives them all access to a common father upon common terms. John Wesley wanted to get rid of that and he said, "Don't call them bishops," and I am sorry we did not follow his advice. Our bishops are bishops in a different sense from other bishops, except those bodies that are related to Methodism—like the United Brethren, for instance, just simply an office in the Church that has been created for convenience, a very important and valuable office, as I verily believe, and one that has been honored in both branches of Methodism by great leaders, leaders whom we are glad to honor, and I allow no man to excel me in respect for the fine men leading the Church in the South and the North as well. But now, consider all this: I do not see why we should be everlastingly emphasizing the fact that we are episcopal, especially when we come to consider the further fact that by reason of the significance that the word "episcopal" has drawn to it in the long history of the Church it is so misleading. We Methodists understand it pretty well, and yet many Methodists do not understand it. Here is the Protestant Episcopal Church with his high prelatical ideas and sacerdotalism and all those things influencing our people. I have been pastor in my time in cities in which a whole body of Protestants was profoundly influenced in its views and in its thoughts about those things by their contact with Catholicism. I do not see why it is necessary for us to keep at the forefront forever a word that is misleading, and why we should put

the emphasis in our Church where it does not belong. Brethren have talked about the influence that has gathered about a great historic name. I do not believe there is any holy and beautiful sentiment in our Church that gathers about the episcopal part of it. It is the Methodist part. That is what we are proud of. We are proud of the "Methodist," believing that it means redemption and universal communion with God. That is what we are proud of and not that our form of government is episcopal. I find myself in accord with the action of our General Conference, except that I should like to drop off the words "in America," as we do not want to circumscribe ourselves, and I am in absolute accord with everything that Bishop McDowell has said. I am sure I shall not be understood as in any way objecting to or reflecting upon our form of government, for, let me repeat, I believe in it and I want our great leaders, but for the reasons that I stated already. As I said a while ago, I have regretted that the word "episcopal" was in our name because I have felt that somehow or other there was a perpetual danger of putting the emphasis where it does not belong, of putting it where it was never meant to be put, and where, as a matter of fact, we have not put it and where I feel sure our great editors do not mean us to put it. Everybody knows, as Dr. Thomas has just suggested, that the Churches who do not have an episcopal form of government are constantly throwing up to us that we are a prelatical Church, that we are akin to Catholicism and Episcopalianism. I deplore the discussion of the last few years about that office.

E. C. Reeves: Well, those Churches that do not have an episcopal form have never succeeded like those who have it.

A. F. Watkins: But it is a different proposition. We haven't any prelacy, and we never claimed to have any.

E. C. Reeves: We have bishops.

A. F. Watkins: Yes, we have bishops; but in a very different sense from any other Church, and we do not want emphasis laid on a word that misleads our own people and other people, and let us not put the emphasis where it does not belong. "The Methodist Church" suits me. It is that word that touches my heart. It is that word about which gathers the sacred sentiment that is so dear and precious. I do not disregard for a moment the importance of sentiment and of associations that gather around words grown sacred by long use. I recognize the fact that sentiment is the most precious and beautiful thing in life, but it is about the word "Methodism" that all the sacred sentiments gather, and not the word "bishop."

Abram W. Harris: I think I agree with practically everything Bishop McDowell said except his conclusion, and I want

to carry what he said just a trifle farther. I have three names, and for ten years I have signed nearly a thousand papers at commencement times, and my signature was "Abram Winegardner Harris." It would have been very much more convenient if they had named me Abram Harris or still more convenient if they had named me Harris or Abram, but it would not do to call me Abram, because there was another character who lived before me much greater in the world and history than I shall ever be. Now, I want to suggest here that not only ought we not, but we have no right, to adopt the words "The Methodist Church." We have not a perfect right to call ourselves the Methodist Church in America, because it is not properly descriptive. I have objected to the great Protestant Episcopal Church proposing to call itself "the *Church*." That is the way I pronounce it, but the trouble is, they pronounce it "*The Church*." The objection to calling us The Methodist Church is that we are not the Methodist Church, never will be the Methodist Church, and I hope that no one will ever claim that we are the Methodist Church. A Methodist Church, if you please, but not *The* Methodist Church. John Wesley said "The world is my parish," and as the parish of the Methodist Church is the whole world, and not America and her dependencies or those who may come to us—Canada might object to our calling ourselves Americans to the exclusion of Canada. And that would not do either, because we are bigger than that. Perhaps our greatest growth may be in a place of which we hardly dream now. Every once in a while someone gets up in the General Conference and wants to change the creed and take out those words "holy catholic Church," and put in some more descriptive phrase because what we have there they think may give an opportunity to think that we are Roman Catholics. Now, I have no objection to the Roman Catholics calling themselves Roman Catholics, but I would criticize their name very strongly if they should say that they were *The Catholic Church*, for that would be a misnomer.

A. F. Watkins: Is our Church any more a Methodist Episcopal Church than the Methodist Episcopal Church—are there not other Methodist Churches with episcopal forms of government?

Abram W. Harris: Our name is the Methodist Episcopal Church; but a name does not mean at all what you are, but it should be your name. I have several names. I don't have the same name everywhere. Bishop McDowell says you had better use the name that the common people call the thing. I don't want to tell you what people call me. I lived in Middletown several years, and I have a name in Middletown that, as far as I know, I have never had any other place. At Northwestern Uni-

versity they call me Dr. Harris, and I have no objection once in a while to somebody's calling me Abe Harris. The other day, walking along the street with Bishop McDowell, he said something to me and I answered him and he said, "Now, Abe Harris —," and it surprised me. I had never heard him say that before. That was the first time he ever said it. It took me by surprise. Yes, we are in a sense a Methodist Church among ourselves, but it is a family name. Sometimes the affectionate name becomes the big name, as in the home where we used to call each other by our pet names. There is a man over in England who signs himself simply George, but he is the king.

A Voice: So are we.

Abram W. Harris: No, you are not. If you try to be a king here, we object. There was a man in Russia who used to be called Nicholas, but now they call him Mr. Romanoff. Don't let your name get too little. The strange thing is that sometimes the smaller the name the bigger the thing becomes. I think the old suit of clothes just about fits.

John R. Pepper: I hope very much that we will call it The Methodist Church. I think we shall save ourselves a great deal of confusion. I was in a town out West not long ago and they were talking about the North Methodist Church and the South Methodist Church. And one of our brethren was being introduced some time ago, and they introduced him as Brother So-and-So, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South of God. I think it would be a very happy thing if we could write that changed name, and I am just thinking of my own Church. The name cut in stone is "First Methodist Church," and we will not have to change it, so I believe the change in name to simply "The Methodist Church" will be a most happy one because, I think, we ought to make some little change for the better and it would address itself, I am certain, to the people of the Methodist Church, South, as coming very near to their own suggestion. I am opposed to putting "America" on it, but I think it would be a most happy solution of the whole thing if we could just call it the Methodist Church. That would be the Methodist Church everywhere on the globe.

Charles A. Pollock: The immediate matter before us, as I understand it, is the motion of Dr. Harris to substitute for all that had previously been offered, in order to limit discussion, that the name of the reorganized Church should contain the word "Episcopal." But the discussion and argument on the motion have assumed a very wide range.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): But all of it was pertinent.

Charles A. Pollock: I made the original motion for the pur-

pose of getting something before the house. I can see that those of you whose minds run upon the ecclesiastical side of this question naturally begin to discuss the word "Episcopal." I have nothing to say about that branch of the subject. I had observed that we are trying in this body to lay plans for the possible bringing together of the Methodisms of the world. I remember that there had been divisions. If I remember correctly, there are something like sixteen branches of the Methodist Church, and in my thought it seemed that the use of that one word "Methodist" would rather be a taking to ourselves of something to which we were not wholly entitled. In other words, it would not differentiate the United Church from some other branches of the Methodist Church. We expect to carry our Church into foreign fields, and then, too, it seemed to me that the attachment of the word "America" would not be suitable. Now, most of us were born in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

E. B. Chappell: No, sir; half of us were born in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Charles A. Pollock: And it is very clear that the word "South," even if that name is attached to the Church in which you gentlemen were born, must be removed when we are getting a name for the new Church. When the great City of New York was enlarging its boundaries and taking in nearly all the other cities near by, it used the words "Greater New York." I wonder if we might learn something from those who are building up that great city and adopt a name something like "The Greater Methodist Episcopal Church." But there would be objections to the word "Greater." Indeed, there is no word and there is no combination of words to which objections cannot be urged. Take the word "prohibition," for instance. I think it is extremely unfortunate that the great temperance movement of this age adopted such a limited word as "prohibition." The word "prohibition" has as many definitions as there are men. I met an old drunken fellow upon the street once, and in his broken speech, caused by the amount of liquor he contained, he insisted that he was a prohibitionist. And yet, that word has gotten into the language of the great movement that is now before the American people so that we cannot take it out. It has a certain definite meaning, not only with reference to our habits and appetites, but also with reference to our thoughts concerning the legal control of the liquor traffic in this country. Take the word "Republican." The men who were born and reared under the use of that word politically rather prefer it, as those who have been Democrats all their lives prefer the word "Democrat." But now, we are coming together in a new relationship. If the word "United" has about it the slightest idea that would be offensive

to the people of the South, I would not for a moment desire to have it placed in the name. I believe, Judge Reeves, that you and I are on the same platform again, if you please, and I say to you and to the brothers here that I shall be satisfied with that great name "The Methodist Episcopal Church."

I. Garland Penn: There is very much of this discussion as to the name of the reunited Church. I had a very interesting letter a short time ago from a distinguished Methodist Episcopalian. If I should name him, everybody would recognize him as one of the great men of the Church. He suggested that if the reorganized Church should fail to give the colored people who are members of the Church the right of representation in the General Conference, suppose those colored people should become an independent body and use the term, Methodist Episcopal Church, provided the Methodist Episcopal Church had abandoned that name in the reunion, what would be the situation? It strikes me there is something in that, and we had better fix the name "The Methodist Episcopal Church."

Bishop Atkins: I want to say a word in reply to Dr. Chappell's proposal and argument. In the first place, I agree with him perfectly as to the purpose of Wesley to eliminate anything of a prelatical nature from the business of the episcopacy; but I want to submit to this company the thought that a hundred and fifty years of fumigation has cleansed all suspicion even from our doors. I want to call attention to the fact also that Episcopal Methodism is the only Methodism that ever succeeded anywhere on a large scale; and, furthermore, that the withdrawal of the word "Episcopal" from our name would be interpreted as a backing out from all it stands for. The Methodist Protestants would so regard it, and the Episcopalians and the world would regard the change of name, by the elimination of the polity element, to mean that this reunited Church intended to go back on all that has been done for a hundred and fifty years. I think, therefore, it would be a heavy blow against the success of this Church from several standpoints, and I hope that the word "Episcopal" will not be dropped from the name. Now, I suggest The Episcopal Methodist Church; but I do not care to delay you with any argument, for that name is logical and covers everything. It gives the emphasis to the right word, the word "Methodist." It is a Methodist Church with a history, the like of which has not been known in the history of any Church from the days of the apostles down to the present time. What we want to do in the designation or in the name is to make that foremost that is the real substance. We should put in the name that indicates our polity, our form of government, and put it in its right place. It may not contain every-

thing that the name stands for, but what it does contain should have reference to what it means. As I say, I think it should be the Episcopal Methodist Church as indicating our polity which has been successful for one hundred and fifty years, whereas other forms have failed. The Wesleyan Church, after large success, is in a state of decline. The Methodist Protestant Church has about 200,000 members, and everything in the world that is disposed to raise its hand against the episcopal form of Government has declined; as I say, the Methodist Protestants have only 200,000 people against the millions of Episcopal Methodists in the United States. I have been associated with those brethren in some work—Dr. Goucher will recall what, and I am sure others will also—and I have been in the council on the subject of the union of the Churches in Japan. I have had the honor to be in that council for four years, and what they went out for was downright antagonism to any episcopacy at all. They proposed a form of episcopacy that had nothing in it. They called it a Japanese term, “sori,” and I told them my opinion of their position was expressed by the word only by changing the pronunciation to “sorry.” In other words, it was an episcopacy denuded of everything that was episcopal. Now, we don’t need to surrender our rights or position in the matter because of our success. I agreed very much with what Bishop McDowell said, though I want it understood that when I was not a bishop and never expected to be, I was a thorough-going admirer of the office. I want to agree with Bishop McDowell that there has never been under heaven any office that puts so many things upon the head and heart of any one man as to be a conscientious bishop in Episcopal Methodism. I had a letter from Bishop Wilson at the end of the first year, commenting on my work, and he said to me: “You will find in the execution of your office that the work of a bishop in our Church is the most exacting and painstaking work that can be assigned to a man”—and I steadfastly gave all of that after twelve years. It does call for consecration and exacts the most devout service from every man in it. It is the greatest place in all Christendom for a man to suffer in silence. Most men do not mind suffering if they can suffer with noise, but the Methodist bishops have to suffer in silence, which is oftentimes the hardest part of it; but no matter what it puts on a man, if any man is willing to take it and bear the burden. The trouble is that very few intimately know what those burdens are beforehand; but fortunately I believe I might say I never undertook any work in my life that I would have undertaken if I had known what I was going into. Fortunately with the occupants of the office, with plenty of men ready to take it, they don’t know what it means; but despite the

fact that in its nature it does call men to suffering in silence, and that there are a great many other limitations that the people outside don't know about, it is the duty of men to take it and execute it if it is tendered to them. There is no office where a man can be of so much service to his fellow men if he performs it with a proper sense of self-sacrifice. The name "Methodist Church" reminds me very much of the Campbellites. They are the Christian Church. We are proposing to become Methodist Churches. There are other Methodist Churches, and I proclaim it is an absolute misnomer to call ourselves the Methodist Church, for it has in it an element of arrogance that is intolerable. What makes the dislike against the Campbellites is that they have assumed to take a name and occupy a position to which they are not entitled. It is not true that we are the only Methodist Church. I grant you that we are the biggest and that we have a good deal of reënforcement of the view that we are the largest Methodist Church and you might say "The Methodist Church," but we are not all of the Methodist Church. I think in a name we should have an eye to two things: first, to tell the truth, and, second, to have it properly descriptive. We can do that by holding on to our old name. We have tested it and we have found it the most successful form of church government for the proclamation of the gospel and the fulfillment of the command of our Lord to preach the gospel to all nations.

Bishop McDowell: A question of personal privilege. I would like to say here that, after hearing the statements made, the illumination on this subject convinces me that we should retain the word Episcopal, and that our name should be The Methodist Episcopal Church, and I shall so vote. All of which shows that there are men who can be convinced by argument and there are others—

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: —who flatter themselves.

Charles M. Stuart: I should like first of all to make grateful acknowledgment of the courtesy extended to me by having the privileges of the house before I was seated as a member, and that too in a beautiful and brotherly obliviousness of your own rules which provide that delegates such as I shall sit in the council but have neither voice nor vote. In the second place, I hope that we shall be known as The Methodist Episcopal Church, as it is a historic name. It is the name hallowed by us in both branches of our Church, and to be made still further glorious by our work in common through all the future. I think we need a witness to the true meaning of the function of the episcopacy. The prelatical idea is not the historical idea of the episcopacy. That idea is an after-thought and Methodists are bearing witness through the years to the real and true meaning of Scriptural

episcopacy. Again, I do not think we should associate "episcopacy" with a liturgical service. Of course, we are not *ritualistic*. Indeed, outside of the Roman Catholic and Greek Churches, there are not many Churches that are ritualistic. They are liturgical, and we are liturgical. There are Churches which have no episcopacy at all that are liturgical. Therefore, we are not bound up with a formal service or liturgy even if we retain the name Episcopal. Then we should remember just how the word "bishop" came into our history. It came in through Bishop Asbury and Bishop McKendree, two of the most democratic men who ever administered affairs in the Methodist Episcopal Church. They were arbitrary men, to be sure, but not because they had any dominating prelatical ideas. It would not have made the slightest difference to Asbury whether he was a superintendent, a bishop, or a pope. He would have been the same straightforward, obstinate, imperial character. I remember Dr. Little saying that we came into the word "bishop" through Bishop Asbury's desire for a short name. He was a good deal like Bishop McDowell. He didn't want to be writing a long name, "superintendent," all the time; he wanted a word of two syllables, and he took it. Once more, I do not think we need to fear a prelatical episcopacy. Whenever our bishops get to be prelatical in temper, if not in theory, we have a way to reach them and bring them down to the sound democratic level. So, for these reasons, I hope we shall retain the traditional name and the historical name as well.

A. J. Lamar: I do not attach any importance to the question that we are discussing this morning. We have had some able arguments and everything that has been said has been in a proper spirit and has been worth saying. I do not mean any reflection on the speakers, but I feel grateful to you for giving me a complete rest in the midst of this arduous meeting. I have not had to think. I have not had my feelings at all aroused. I have not cared what name was given to the baby, and I do not think it makes much difference. I think the question of name is largely on a par with that ancient question which has been so often proposed for debate—namely, the essential difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. I do not care whether you name it The Methodist Episcopal Church or The Methodist Church. Either one will suit me.

A. F. Watkins: The embarrassment Bishop McDowell and Brother Harris had in the writing of their names reminds me of an old man, Aaron Higginbotham. He went into a drug store to buy some asafetida, and there was a new clerk there. The old man said, "I want five cents' worth of asafetida," and the young clerk was rather reluctant about selling him five cents'

worth; but the old man said, "I want that asafetida," so the clerk put it up for him and then he said, "I want to have it charged." The clerk said, "What is your name?" and he answered: "My name is Aaron Higginbotham." Then the clerk said: "Here, take it. I wouldn't write 'Higginbotham' and 'asafetida' both for five cents." I would prefer that our Church be named The Methodist Church for reasons that have been very strongly brought out. I have no objection to its being called The Methodist Episcopal Church. I have no sort of sympathy with the suggestion that I have heard from time to time that among the concessions made by our branch of the Church one was the surrender of our historical name. Our historical name is The Methodist Episcopal Church, and we added in brackets something that indicated the local habitation. I do not think there was an obligation for you to do so, certainly no understanding to that effect. You might just as logically have tacked "North" on the end of yours, for that was your locus. My first preference is for The Methodist Church, but if we do not do that, and adopt the name Methodist Episcopal Church, I shall be pleased with that name.

John F. Goucher: Dr. Thomas's speech, which was so carefully prepared and so comprehensive, reminds me of another argument I have heard of. A Baptist and a Methodist were arguing the question of their religious faith, and the Baptist said: "There is no justification for the existence of the Methodist Church. If you can show me in the Scripture anything that justifies it, I will yield the point. We have Baptists mentioned in the Bible, but there is no place in the Bible where there is any reference to Methodists." And the Methodist turned to the twentieth verse of the twenty-first chapter of Revelation, where it speaks of the foundations of the wall of the city, and read, "the twelfth (a Methodist) amethyst," to which the Baptist replied, "Let me see that." He handed him the Bible, and the Baptist looked at it and said: "I yield the argument. I never noticed that before."

Bishop Atkins: I want to add an illustration. You talk about taking the "Episcopal" out and the people won't know you and won't know where you are heading. That reminds me that some years ago a gentleman wanted to ship a billy goat from one place to another, so he tied a tag onto the goat with his destination on it, and sent it to the express office by a colored boy. The billy goat, with the usual tendency of billy goats, chewed up the tag, and when the colored boy got him to the express office the man said, "Where is this goat going?" The boy said, "It is on there," and the expressman said: "There is nothing on there

but a string." The negro took a look, and said: "Fo' de Lawd, this billy goat done chawed up the place whar he's goin.'"

The session then closed with a benediction by Bishop Cranston.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The meeting was called to order by Bishop McDowell.

Dr. Ivey conducted the devotional exercises.

The hymn, "What a Friend we have in Jesus," was sung.

Prayer was offered by Dr. T. N. Ivey.

The roll was called, and the following were present: Bishops Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. B. Murrah, W. A. Candler, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Ministers: F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar, Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, R. E. Jones, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. J. Wallace, C. M. Stuart. Laymen: H. N. Snyder, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White, G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock.

The journal of the morning session was read, corrected, and approved.

Bishop Denny took the chair as presiding officer.

H. M. Du Bose: I have been with the Special Committee of Eight all morning; and, coming in, I gather from the minutes that the question of the name of the reorganized Church is pending in two forms. Is that right?

Frank M. Thomas: Four forms: Methodist Episcopal, Methodist, United Methodist, and Episcopal Methodist.

Bishop McDowell: A question as to the order of the house. I raise the question, in order to make it perfectly clear, that we took up this subject this morning in the absence of material for a continuation of the business under which we were operating. I do not think that we quite said so, but I think we had half a mind that we were going to have just such a discussion as we did have until the report came back from the Committee of Eight.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Is that committee ready to report?

Bishop McDowell: I raise the question—

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: The committee is ready to report, but we haven't the report back.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Then we can go on with the other matter until that report comes.

H. M. Du Bose: The language used by both branches of the Methodist Episcopal Church has given "Methodist Episcopal

Church" historical standing, and in a sense has given it legal validity; but I believe I have before my own Church successfully shown, I have to myself at least, that the original name of the Methodist Church in this country was the "Methodist Episcopal Church in America."

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Permit me to say, Dr. Du Bose, that I am just informed that we are operating under the ten-minute rule. Is that correct?

Secretary Thomas: Yes.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Then you are entitled to notice to that effect.

H. M. Du Bose: I shall be through in less than ten minutes. The original name was the "Methodist Episcopal Church in America." The only thing that was ever established by any legal process is "The Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America." Waiving all these matters, however, it remains that "Methodist Episcopal Church" is the name of the great body of Methodists in the Northern half of the country, and largely in the other half of it, and that "Methodist Episcopal Church, South," is the name of that part of it which has its representation chiefly in the Southern half of the Continent. I have a preference for one or the other of these forms, properly adopted. I was responsible, in a large measure, for the passing through the General Conference of my Church, and sending to the Annual Conferences, a referendum asking that the "Methodist Episcopal Church, South," be made the "Methodist Episcopal Church in America." I did this for reasons of history and sentiment, but I now desire to put myself on record as favoring the form as stated by Judge Pollock, "The United Methodist Episcopal Church."

Edwin M. Randall: The United Methodist Church.

Charles A. Pollock: Dr. Du Bose stated my position correctly.

H. M. Du Bose: I do not see how we can call ourselves "The Methodist Church of America." There are other Methodist Churches here. There are other Methodist Episcopal Churches here; but to add to that form the word "United" would cover the historical ground passed over, and exactly describe the new conditions, "The United Methodist Episcopal Church." I shall always be opposed to leaving the word "Episcopal" out as long as we remain Episcopal, and I apprehend we shall for some time to come. So, I round out the ten minutes allotted to me by again saying that I favor the form "United Methodist Episcopal Church."

Bishop Cranston: I hope we shall be able to reach a vote on this matter after what has been a satisfactory discussion of the subject. But I happen to know that Bishop Atkins, who

has been unable to get the floor during the last several days, wants to make a speech on the general subject of the status of the negro; and if we are not to reach a vote on this matter now, I want to move that Bishop Atkins be allowed the privilege of making his speech on that general subject, and any other member who wishes to speak on the other report.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Bishop Atkins: I suppose what remarks I have to make would come in under the report that is to be offered, and I promise not to speak again.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I put the motion just as I understood it to be offered.

Bishop Atkins: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and brethren.

Bishop Cranston: The motion was offered in recognition of the right which, in the natural order of things, would have fallen to Bishop Atkins to-day but for the fact that we had a committee out and some other business on hand. This is to restore to Bishop Atkins his rights.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Would it not be well to inquire of Bishop Atkins whether he wishes to speak now or after the report from our committee comes in?

Bishop Atkins: If it is your pleasure, I will make some remarks now. Responding to the timely challenge of Bishop Hamilton the other day that we should speak on the subject, I remarked that I had been fostering a speech for several days. I do not mean that I was preparing a speech, but I was fostering a purpose to make some remarks at the proper time. I have had, as all the rest of you have probably had, a half dozen pretty good speeches destroyed by having them made by other people. I have seen more good places to make a speech than at any other meeting I have ever been in before, if I could have made it before the other fellow, but he got there first. That relieves me, however, of the necessity of going over a great deal of ground that otherwise would have had to be gone over. The speeches made have been fine speeches. I don't think I have ever heard such bright and such good speeches on any theme, and I have been accustomed to hearing good speaking all my life in our General Assembly. I have been a little surprised at one or two things which I may well mention. One is that a company of as wise men could say so many good things off the subject as have been said.

Frank M. Thomas: After-thoughts?

Bishop Atkins: No, sir; that is one of the results of speaking. There is another thing that I would remark, and that is, considering all the circumstances, the spirit of this proceeding has been the finest I have ever heard.

A Voice: Thank God.

Bishop Atkins: Yes, it is a cause to thank God, and if the subject about which this meeting is cognizant were one that pertained only to people such as we are, we should have no difficulty in settling the question. We must not make a mistake, however, at this point. I think I ought to make another remark because of my real embarrassment, and I am not in the habit of suffering extraordinary embarrassment in public speaking. In the first place, I did not want to be on this Commission. I have not been here until this meeting. I have been familiar with these things since childhood. I have been on councils related to these matters and I knew the difficulties in the way, and I had as much work of my own as my health and strength would enable me to perform. I hoped that you gentlemen would stay at it so that I would not be charged with any of it. Then, I am embarrassed that on both North and South—that is, on both sides—were men that looked backward, that did not look at the spirit of the time. Now, I think I can say that I am intimate with as many members of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church as any of you, and I think I wrote to my colleagues that they should stand squarely on the platform of our Church as announced in Oklahoma, and I do not think anybody is averse to any readjustment that will be perfectly just to everybody and that will open wider the way to the kingdom of God through Methodism. I hope, if any of you have such a feeling, you will be kind enough to withhold it, and believe that I am here, not to hold back the work in hand, but to help it as far as I can; and if any of my deliveries do not seem to be hastening toward a union of the Churches, you will understand it is my view how best to get together and stay together, for that is what I desire. We are not coming back. I don't want you to feel that way. Dr. Stuart's allusion did not hurt anybody except that it did show a viewpoint of some that we were coming back. I am here to invite you gentlemen back, and I will tell you, Bishop McDowell, that the original Methodism of the United States is Southern Methodism. We don't claim to be the mother Church. When two people are born at the same time, one cannot be mother and the other daughter. They are twins. For example, the only territory in America ever trodden by the sacred feet of the Wesleys is here in Georgia and a little territory in South Carolina. The first church was built at Sam's Creek, Maryland. I know others have different views, but Asbury, who knew Methodism better than anybody else, says that this was the first Methodist meetinghouse built on the American continent. Then the first General Conference was in 1784, in Baltimore; and when they took the census to find out who were in America they found about 16,000,

and more than 14,000 of them were in the South. Another fact is, the first Sunday school organized on this globe was organized in Virginia. That is an acknowledged fact. Then Lee of Virginia took Methodism up into New England, and you can tell New England that when we get reorganized we will send some more Lees up there. Then, when they organized the schools of Methodism, history shows that in the Asburian period, when eight schools were established, seven of them were in the South and one in the North, and you all know that the first native-born bishop was William McKendree of Virginia. But we are not claiming to be mother and daughter, but twins, and that is the ground upon which I invite you gentlemen back into the fold after years of wandering. Now, these sentiments apart, I want to say two or three things that I trust may contribute a little toward the solution of the problem. The first is, we are here with distinct directions from the General Conference of our Church. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, does want union with the Methodist Episcopal Church, but it wants it on conditions that will not produce a rupture or disruption. Kipling, who is one of the most expert staters of things who writes, says that racial consciousness is nothing but human consciousness with an erection of bristles and a readiness for contests, and that it is the most honorable thing in any race and ought to be respected. So, I don't see anything in this, I am sure, contrary to the most perfect brotherliness on that line, and I want to say on this point, because I am coming to the subject—but as some of you did, very slowly—I want to say that when Brother Blackwell commenced confessing our sins he confessed entirely too much. I have often noticed and have for a long time known that when criminals commence confessing they sometimes confess to things that could be easily proven they never did. What I want to say is that we haven't done our duty entirely, but we have had hindrances; and you haven't done your duty either, and I say that in love. Whoever made these mistakes, they were there and I was glad that Brother Maddin gave those valuable statistics yesterday, and they should be considered in connection with this, that while you were doing Freedmen's Aid Society work which was very valuable, while you were sending money to schools, special contributions, we were chipping in all the time—not chipping in really, but pouring in a regular stream of contributions to the colored churches and the colored schools and the colored individuals, and to all the interests that pertain to the colored people; not only individually doing that, but the Church itself has spent millions and millions for the colored people, and I am glad that they have taken advantage of the opportunity to help the colored people. Now, I don't like to hear the

negro discounted as an inferior. I understand the Anglo-Saxon is the greatest race on earth, but there are various ways of showing inferiority and superiority, so I do not enter into that except to say that the African was in slavery two hundred and fifty years and then had freedom fifty years, and that makes it impossible for me to understand how any sane man can expect that race to arrive at its real and true greatness in many directions. Without controverting your statement as to the inferiority of the race, I say that the progress of the African race in the last fifty years is one of the marvelous things of history. A whole lot of people do not appreciate where he is because they do not know the depth from which he had to climb to reach the heights that he has gained, and I am brimful of hope for the race if it is properly dealt with by the so-called superior race. I am for all of them. I am for the inclusion of all of them in the Church under proper forms and conditions, just like I am for other classes of white people like ourselves. I see no ground to discriminate against anybody. Now, I do not believe with Bishop Hamilton—I beg pardon, Bishop, but everybody has to take a “pop” at you—I noticed when I was a boy that if you wanted to find where the good apples were you would go to the tree with a lot of sticks lodged up in it where the boys had been throwing at them. But I think the Bishop is fundamentally wrong. My conception of the whole theory of life is that there is no equality of race except where that equality resides in justice.

Bishop Hamilton: That is one thing.

Bishop Atkins: Yes, but it is not all. It does not apply to anything but the availability of Jesus Christ to all men in all races, and when you get a man converted everything good in him that is normal begins to work out into civilization in various lines and ways and you cannot stop it. It is not according to God's will that men should be born perfect in all the relations of life. That comes only through the efforts of the man himself and nobody else. So, therefore, I differ from the Bishop on that proposition that that kind of racial equality is involved in the work of redemption because we all have equal rights to be saved through Jesus Christ our Lord. On another point I wish to make a remark to the effect that I am in thorough sympathy with all the good and noble and generous treatment of the African race. We have had so many kindnesses spoken of, that it is a little hard to keep from being mixed up on them. We have had statements about white men who wouldn't let them open a door or wouldn't let them send a telegram and all sorts of things like that. Now, let me tell an instance: I was in a meeting something like this and we were meeting at the home of Dr. Goucher in Baltimore, that sanctuary of Christian hospitality that has spread its in-

fluence over so many in both communions. Most of you know what a man he is. There came a boy with a telegram, which he handed to me, and someone, I think Dr. Goucher himself, stepped up and said: "Bishop, I hope there is nothing wrong at home." I said: "Yes, there is something wrong at home; it is a telegram from my wife stating that our old colored cook, Aunt Eliza, is quite sick, and she is starting with her to take her home and asks that I meet her at Asheville, where they change cars." When they got there, I was there, and I put her in a coach and, knowing the nature of her affliction, gave her a stimulant every few minutes, and when we got there, my conveyance was there and the natural thing was for the colored boy to take my wife home; but my wife said, "No, you take Aunt Eliza." And so we did. On another occasion my son said that a certain negro man was sick, and asked me if I had seen him, and I said no. He was not a very religious man: he drank and had trouble which made me sympathize with him. We went right over and went in and talked to the family and the doctor about his condition and about his religion, and we all knelt and had prayers with him; and that was not any special goodness on my part, and that is not any special occurrence. It is going on all the time all over the South. That is the way we feel toward the colored people. If you hear a lot of these instances of rudeness and mistreatment of the negro, don't believe them. I think that if the Northern people had read "Uncle Tom's Cabin" less and the Bible more we should be in a much better situation, because that misrepresents things by stating things many of which were true, in isolated cases, but which did not at all represent the South as a rule. Now, the General Conference recommends unification with the colored people. I can understand why this proposition will not be entirely satisfactory to the colored men here representing your Church; but I want to say in the first place that I enjoyed Charley Bishop's enthusiasm, and when he moved up to 1918 I was disappointed. We cannot do this in 1918, because the life of the Church is always slow—the only dictum should be *festina lente*, "make haste slowly." Now, don't be mistaken and don't think that we are not in favor of Charley's proposition. We are for it, but there are some other very great responsibilities involved with reference to the colored people of the South. Suppose that we pass this without a proper incorporation of the other colored Methodists in this great Associate Conference. There would not be three Annual Conferences in all Southern Methodism but that would oppose the measure. They would express their confidence in the action taken, but they would vote it down until we could attend to the other matter, so that while we would like to exercise haste we must go

slowly enough not to get up a ruction. We don't want to have that. Now, you have all the advantage of us in this proposal, and I suppose you are aware of it. In view of the mixed condition of our society you have every advantage of us whenever this question is agitated, and we are the sufferers by it; and we shall all be sufferers, and unionism will be the sufferer too if we make the mistake of adopting something that will cause friction in our bodies.

Bishop McDowell: I would like to inquire of Bishop Atkins how we have the advantage of you. That is a new point to me.

Bishop Atkins: I don't mind telling you. I thought as sharp a man as Bishop McDowell and as good a manager would know; but if he condescends to accept information on a point of that kind from me, I will remark that there is a spirit of unionism abroad. Ever since the war has been on there has been a disposition to unite. That is the spirit of the age. Now, whenever there is in a community an agitation of this question with a possibility of union there are among our people, both in and out of the Church, numbers of people who condemn us for holding to a state or condition of separation, no matter what influences us when it is proposed that we can do otherwise, and it therefore gives some advantage on the side of unity. I believe that is universally true, and we lose and you gain every time there is an agitation of this question without accomplishing anything definite. Now, the thing I started to explain when I was interrupted is this: We have a lot of good negro Methodists—there are no better negroes anywhere than in the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church. We set them off and they were under our supervision and we are giving an annual collection in every church in Methodism to the support of their institutions, and we are all wanting to enlarge that. We would like to give ten times as much; but if we go to the General Conference and say that you want a union of Methodism and we have a union, but only have that part already in the churches, we will be in a state of things that we can't manage to save ourselves. Let the negro race take up the idea that these men belonging to the Methodist Episcopal Church are to be looked upon as a colored aristocracy of Methodism, and you don't know what would happen. They don't go by logical steps, but they just go here and there. I think any union that does not show proper consideration for all the elements and go as far as we can in providing for the other elements will be more than anything else an obstruction to reorganized Methodism, not throughout the South only, but everywhere; whereas, if we treat it as a race question, we eliminate that and then we have all the Southern people still assisting the negro Churches. You don't expect to cease giving financial as-

sistance to your colored element and we cannot be expected to cease giving to ours. There is an economic question involved; but if we hold out the opportunity and express our views with reference to the desirability and feasibility of such a course and ask the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at least to provide as far as possible for such a combination, then we put ourselves in a position to answer back to every man, white or black, who criticizes what we have done. I could enter into a long discussion of what might arise, and some of the Southern people and some of the Northern would recognize that I have a correct view on this. Under the order that we have it is expected that we shall endeavor to unite all these Methodisms: the C. M. E. and the Zion M. E., as well as the Methodist Episcopal, all contain a large number of colored people. Those were the instructions; and the idea of the Church when it gave us our instructions was that we should get all the Methodists into this combination. My friends in the Methodist Episcopal Church say that they believe there are difficulties in the way of doing this. I reply that I do not so believe. From the letters Brother Penn read, it would appear that that is the case, but I could have gotten letters on the other side and more than he got. The colored people are amenable to reason; they are not irrational. They are reasonable. They are the best natured people on the face of the earth. They are not going to be obstreperous if they are rightly treated. No one likes to be left out of anything; and the negro wants to have his say just like anybody else, and he doesn't want his authority taken from him. He is sensitive, and if we make a mistake in that regard it is going to be a costly one. You brethren of the South know that this is so. And you brethren of the North will know it too when you have had the experience with them that we have had. You will have the same sort of experience. Now, I have no personal objection to the negroes. I never miss an opportunity of talking with them and advising with them. I remember when I was in Asheville, N. C., they quit asking me for advice and coming around me, and I asked what was the matter that they were not coming to me any more, and one of them told me that a white man told them they had better quit having Atkins talk to them or he would have them all voting the Democratic ticket. By the way, that reminds me of something. We have a lot of Republicans in our Church, but you never see a Democrat in the Methodist Episcopal Church in the South. If any of you know of any, speak out. I never saw one in my life.

Bishop Cooke: Where have you been?

Bishop Atkins: All over.

Charles W. Kinne: We have one in Jacksonville, the Chairman of the Board of Instruction of our County.

Bishop Atkins: Good for Jacksonville, but that is not part of my speech.

E. M. Randall: We have quite a lot.

E. C. Reeves: Johnson City is Republican.

Bishop Atkins: Now, brethren, none of us are disposed to carry political questions into this great matter; and I tell you again, repeating what I have said heretofore, that a proper report for the inclusion of these other Methodists will tend to work for harmony and union in Methodism. I hope that I have convinced you that I am in favor of union, and if you will heed me in the settling of this question you will include all the colored men in one Church.

A. F. Watkins: Just exactly what would you suggest—what steps would you advise us to take to secure this unification?

Bishop Atkins: That is something I cannot say. The best that I could suggest would be that we would have a small committee appointed to bring in something on the subject of what we should do. I believe that would be the best thing, and if we do it right you can get great results.

R. E. Blackwell: Mr. White and I have been fired at a good deal. Dr. Young found objections to my speech and Mr. Maddin, too, seemed to think he had to answer me.

P. D. Maddin: Not a bit.

R. E. Blackwell: And now, Bishop Atkins, the point I was making was that whatever the South has done for the negro has been done by the State and not by the Church. Did I not say that the State was the good Samaritan and that our Church had to be careful that it did not act the part of the priest and the Levite? I showed that the Southern people were coming in helpful contact with the negro in school work, as teachers, as principals, and as inspectors, but not as religious guides. I am a trustee of one of the negro schools, appointed by the Governor of the State, and I am working with the negroes there, but I have not the same access to them religiously. That was the point I was making, and my argument was that we should get such access if we could. I had intended to illustrate what the Church might always have done by the experience of Bishop Galloway and Dr. Young, both of whom had told of their work. Dr. Young has spoken of his. Bishop Galloway gave me an illuminating account of his efforts to help negro preachers. At first they were suspicious of him, but when they found that he was not trying to make Democrats of them they received him most enthusiastically. This has always made me feel that we could have been a great help to the negro religiously if we had

not put him off into a separate Church. In my speech I was not confessing the sins of the South, but showing that there was no contact between us and the negroes religiously. I have a copy of my speech which I have not revised nor corrected; and if there is any one who thinks that I ran down the South, I wish he would take the copy and read it. I insist that Dr. Young and Bishop Atkins misinterpreted what I said. I do not deny that the South has done great things for the negro and poured out money in helping him. What I do say is that what we are doing is being done through the State and not through the Church, that organized democracy is doing more for the negro than organized Christianity. I know that the Church is helping to create this democratic spirit, but my contention is that we have lost contact with the negro religiously, and I want to get it back. Men in various Methodist institutions in the South have said to me that we must get it back.

Bishop Denny: I respond to a number of private requests that have come to me from my brethren, and also to the courteous call of Bishop McDowell, not that I believe that I am in a position to throw any special light on the solution of the matter that is before us, because there is nothing that I believe to be entirely definite before us; and because I prefer to hold back until something definite is before us, I have rather reserved anything that I have had to say. But there are a number of eliminations that ought to be made in considering a question of this kind. In the first place, those who have been members heretofore of bodies that have had questions similar to the questions that are before us, have very naturally taken that position, and those positions are referred to. But beyond the question of personal consistency there is no pertinency in the individual position that one may have taken at Chattanooga or at a General Conference. What we are concerned with here is not the personal opinion of the men who were in those bodies, but our concern is with the action of those bodies, and former personal opinions can be eliminated. Another elimination of perhaps more importance is in the matter of the form of argument to which we have listened and to which we have been accustomed in speech and publication. There are very few men on this floor who have entirely forgotten what Butler said on analogy, and who have entirely overlooked the fact that by analogy alone you can prove nothing; and yet analogies have been crowded into this question as a basis for a convincing conclusion. Everywhere we have heard of late years that railroads and banks and business concerns have united and that coalition and union are the order of the day. You can unite dollars, brethren, you can do that very easily; but in this

case we are dealing with something infinitely better, infinitely different from dollars. A form of government is nothing in the world but a means for the accomplishment of some greater end. The end that we are set to serve is the spiritual upbuilding of the people of the kingdom, and wherever we build a church or however handsome it may be, and wherever we perfect a piece of organization, however valuable it may be when used as an end, it is only as a means that it has any value at all. So, we ought to be able to rid ourselves of these inconsequential analogies. Here are two families living side by side and the income of either is equal to the demands of the family on a comfortable basis. The expenses of the two households are considerably more than the expenses of one household would be. Does anybody advocate that because we unite two banks or two railroads or two steamship lines or anything of that kind that consequently you should bring those two families together? Some families are hardly able to keep the peace when there is nobody there except the members of the family. I do not want to use any personal illustrations, but I can speak of that more freely because my home is kept by one who is personally perfectly able to keep it. You say, Do you mean by that to intimate that you are not in favor of a solution of the difficulty? No, I do not mean anything of the kind. I am here honestly. You know a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has no vote anywhere, except when it comes to determining whether the General Conference has kept within the limits of the Constitution of the Church. He is not a member of any Conference; but a man who accepts a position on a Commission of this kind is honestly bound to do all he can to carry out the purposes of the body that put him on the Commission. Now, I could suggest quite a number of remedies for what seems to me to be a condition of things that is not creditable to either Church. I do not know how wide a reading these speeches will have, but I shall not let my vocabulary run to the limit of my convictions in speaking of the condition of American Episcopal Methodism in this country; but, to say the least, it is not creditable to either Church. Our difficulties and frictions certainly ought to be composed. There ought to be some different arrangement made. We surely ought to be able, without reflection on our own understanding, to get down before God and to be able to say to Him that the whole of us, all that there is within us, is bent on doing the will of God; and whatever wisdom we have, none of us can improve on the wisdom or on the will of God. Of course, every man wants to see the differences composed and a better state of affairs brought about, greater

brotherliness manifested, larger usefulness shown, a more definite attention fixed upon the spiritual side of the work we are called upon to do; a recognition that, however enthusiastic we may grow over the numbers we may have gathered and the dollars we may have accumulated and the people whom we get into the Churches, unless they are born in God and have a measure of the fullness of Christ, we have done nothing. Then again, take up this matter of analogy. There are men sitting here who have not forgotten what John Stuart Mill said on that subject. They once knew pretty much all that he said. They knew practically all that has been published on methods of proofs from Descartes to Noah K. Davis. We have not forgotten that one swallow does not make a summer; and individual instances, unless they be logically generalized, can never mean much. There are always wrongs. Would we have had any such complicated system of judicature as exists in this country unless we anticipated wrong? Why is any court provided in this country? Somebody is likely to do wrong, and here is a provision to right that wrong. I know Coke says there is no wrong for which the common law does not provide a remedy; but I am a heretic on that point of Lord Coke's. There are a great many wrongs for which there are no remedies in this life. Take up another analogy—and I don't care to run through these illustrations to too great extent, and I hope I am not wasting your time. The State has gone ahead of the Church, we are told. It has been said that the Church lags behind the State. Why? The State has made provision for the education of the negro. But, brethren, has there been no action that provides for the Christianizing of the negro brother? Does the analogy warrant the conclusion that because the State has established its schools in various sections of the country, all over the country for negroes and whites alike, and because you do not bring the negro into the lawmaking body of the Church, therefore the State is far ahead of the Church? Brethren, you know that some of us would have to be made over before we could draw such a conclusion as that. If the analogy were to be applied, it would be applied at this point. How about bringing into the faculty of our white colleges our negro brethren? There is close by me a Church school in the city of Richmond. Does any one propose, do you think it would be wise, do you think it would be just, do you think it would do any good—don't you know it would set fire to things, to undertake to put into that faculty a negro brother? And this not because he lacks the intellectual ability to go there, not because he lacks the mental training to go there; but you all know that could not and would not be done, and ought not to be done. The conclusion to which

this analogy would lead is that our colored brother should be given a place in white schools. Bishop Atkins has said, and I wish to emphasize it, that this discussion over the negro will do a world of good. I have heard voice after voice at our Annual Conferences throughout the South proclaiming to our people gathered there that one of the responsibilities that lie at our door for which we must answer to Almighty God is the fact that we have the best access to the negro because he is closest to us by his residence, and we are not doing what we might do; and the wrong God punishes is not merely the doing of a thing that ought not to be done, but it is equally the not doing of a thing that ought to be done. What is likely to stir up our Church on this great question and lead us to meet with greater fervor and larger sacrifices if need be—and there is not much service without sacrifice—will be a great blessing to our Church; and so I thank God for this discussion and the influence that will come out of it. It has been wonderful in brotherly spirit, and plain things have been said that ought to be said, and plain things that ought to be said among Christian gentlemen ought never to make any difference in personal relations. We have had a good deal more of exhortation than of exposition on this question. A good deal of that ought to be eliminated. It ought not to surprise any of you brethren to be told about our relations to the negro, our interest in the negro, and—I do not blink the word—our love for the negro. Brethren, the first arms into which we came when we entered the world were arms of negroes. Before the arms of the mothers of most of the men on this floor had clasped their babes, those arms that we used to call the arms of “Mammy” had already held us, and perhaps Mammy had put the first kiss on our faces. Infractions of those strict and necessary home laws, with which infractions too frequently many of us were familiar, were first confessed when we stood before our negro mammies, and we sobbed ourselves to sleep night after night upon their heaving bosoms. When sickness came, who sat with greater fidelity and with more care beside the bedside than the negro mammy? When death entered the homes, when we had no defense, who mingled their tears with ours as the negroes we knew mingled their tears? And when they too died and their coffins were brought into the homes which we knew in our South, our tears dropped on their faces as their tears had dropped on the faces of our beloved dead. Brethren, back yonder before the Christian era was Terence, the Roman who had been a slave, who in the 25th line of his play entitled “The Self-Tormentor” uttered a truth new to the world, perhaps not fully understood even by himself, a truth we ought not to forget, “I am a man; I think

nothing that concerns humanity is foreign to me"; and the Roman audience that first heard those words was so overcome that the play could not proceed. The narrow cap that fitted over the head of the Roman senator and soldier, that bound him down only to a horizon of small diameter, was suddenly lifted, the horizon was greatly extended. We are men. How could we live side by side and in the intimate relations such as you do not sustain, of which you know only by the hearing of it, how would it be possible for men to live in the relations in which we live with the negroes without an interest in them and without a love for them? It ought not to be necessary even to refer to that to let the facts be known. Now, do you say to me that all I have spoken is practically elimination? You ask me, What have you to propose, what do you suggest, what can be offered to us that may open the way for a better relation between the two Churches and a substantial fulfillment of the hopes of the General Conferences of the two Churches, as expressed in their action? Indicate anything we can do. The man who can answer that question is under obligation to God to make the statement if he is in this room, for that is a consummation devoutly to be wished. It is next to an axiom that you have not truly educated a man until you have brought him to a position of independence in thought and in action. A man who is reared, I care not in what home or what may be his environments or what may be the streams of knowledge that may be poured into his mind or how fully he may have trained his faculties, if he has not come to the point where he can determine for himself what he has to do, has not been educated. You cannot keep a race on crutches and have it develop. You have to give that race the opportunity of manifesting itself, of working out and reaching its own conclusions. Do you think the negroes as a race have no contribution to make to Christianity? You have read the history of the Christian Church. Do you not know how long it took Almighty God to wipe out and to grind out and to stamp out the tendency to idolatry, on the part of the Israelites, so that he could have a people who looked to God alone and not to Ashtaroath and Baal and Moloch, and all those other mental figments? And he sifted them through the fine sieve of the Babylonian captivity, after he had brought them time and time again on to the bloody ridge of their own country that made the connection between that Asiatic and that African empire, the Mesopotamian and the Egyptian. We ought to know something of what contribution was made to Christianity by the Alexandrian school. What would the world be without Athanasius and the great Cappadocians, and the men who stood as they stood and held the bridge of faith for the

critical hour when all was at stake?—for when the person of our Lord is involved all is at stake. Go along the northern countries of Africa and come to Hippo near Carthage, where was Augustine, whence the almost Cynic yet the dear old Tertullian, and do you mean that those white people settled there—those nearly three hundred African bishops who, with all their churches, were swept into oblivion by the long arm of the vandals—made no contribution to Christianity? Do you mean to say that Huss the Bohemian and Luther the Saxon and Calvin the Frenchman made no contribution to Christianity? Have we never read, even though the feet of our forefathers may never have touched the solitary Iona, of Columbia? Have we never read that sermon of John Robinson's, preached to the Pilgrim Fathers when they were about to sail for this country, to go into a new country, surrounded by new conditions, to live new lives: "Do not be surprised if God gives you a new view of truth"? There is a marvelous wealth in the negro that some of you do not know. You have touched him in your General Conferences, but you do not know the wealth within him. There is a wealth of loyalty and devotion in the negro race. There is a wealth of emotional power, there is a power of pathos; and when you touch many of them there is a power of oratory we might well envy if it were proper for us to envy anything. But, on the other hand, just as the Jews were open to the thrust of cruel mocking—I do not know why our translators put in that word "cruel," I do not see how there can be mocking unless it be cruel—there were people who felt that mocking was next to fire and lions and swords, so the negro is stung by mocking, and you can stir up the greatest trouble if you get among our negro brethren and just begin to mock. They are not going to stand it, and they never would. As I see this question, as it appeals to me, we must give the negro a chance, the best chance we can give him, the best opportunity we can open to him, the largest opening we can set before him. That leads to the question, "What negroes?" The negroes of the Methodist Episcopal Church? Bishop Atkins told you the exact truth on that. You could not get it through—he said three Annual Conferences—I am not sure that I know even one that you could get it through, if you ignore the rest of the 10,000,000 negroes in the South. I have not found that you brethren from the North have considered any negroes except your own. You do not seem to see those other negroes in the South. It seems to me your eyes are fixed solely upon those 311,000 or 350,000—whatever it is, I have not been able to find the exact statistics, but on that about one-third of a million of your own. There are about 10,000,000 of them, and one-half of them, as you heard from the figures

Brother Maddin brought you yesterday, are in no Christian Church at all. Now, brethren, some provision ought to be made in the plan for all the negroes in this country, and unless some provision be made for more than the negro who is in the Methodist Episcopal Church (I am not a prophet, but it does not take a prophet, it simply takes common sense), the plan will not go through the Church, and it ought not to go through the Church. There is another side of this question that perhaps may be grounded in prejudice. You were talking about names this morning, the name of the Church. You are not going to settle that very easily. I do not know how many of you are fathers, but did you ever have any difference in the family about the name of the baby? It is not always an easy thing to name a baby. More feeling can be stirred up about that very thing perhaps than about any other. "The Freedmen's Aid Society" to the Southerner does not sound a bit as if the angels had been singing, and I should not think it would be altogether satisfactory to our colored brethren. The day when they were *freed men* has about passed. Then another thing. Here you are in Savannah, just an ordinary Southern city. You can find negroes scattered all around here, coming straight down the coast from Richmond and Wilmington and Charleston and Savannah, and on down. Suppose you come into our Churches here and say that we have united, we are going to take up a collection for the Freedmen's Aid Society, and it is one of the assessments on the Church. You say, Dr. Ainsworth, you will be kind enough to hold yourself responsible for this particular Conference collection, and to raise it in your Church. Some of the people over there who have pride enough and perhaps piety enough to see that the Church does not report short on its assessment will assist Brother Ainsworth. He will have the benefit of their help; but the great majority of the people who are supposed to make the donations will say, "Is this for the colored people that belong to the Methodist Episcopal Church? Aren't our negroes going to get any of this collection—is none of this for them?" What do you think is going to be the result? I put that before you. Perhaps you had not thought of that, but I tell you two sticks of dynamite are to be found right there, and they had better be taken out before you go too far with it. I do not see any solution of the trouble that we have before us that does not take into account all the negroes that we can reach. You say they will not be satisfied to come into any separate organization. I have just been reading in your last General Conference Journal where you are committed on that question, the unification of the negro Churches of this country. I have just been reading the report which has been signed, among others, by the

two negro members of this Commission. You will find it on page 1318, if I remember correctly, and also on page 714. I think those are the pages. You say, "Will they not resent that?" Brethren, if we go to these colored brethren of ours and say to them, "Here, not only do we want to help you, for God forbid that we should ever lose sight of the fact that when God made Adam a helpmeet, it was not only somebody who could help Adam, but somebody whom Adam could help, and there is no help that is not a reciprocal help," and there is a great deal these colored brethren can do for us and we want to let them know that we appreciate that fact; now, say to them that in the providence of God, while there is not in this wide world and never have been 10,000,000 negroes who have stood upon as high a plane as the 10,000,000 American negroes stand on to-day, the history of the world has not shown it before; while that is the case, just go to those negroes and say to them frankly and fully (I believe you brethren raise about \$150,000 a year for them—I am not certain about that—I have not taken the time to examine the statistics). Then let us start with the colored brethren in your Church and the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church and say, "Here, brethren, is a fund raised for you to handle in coöperation with us so that we may see that it is properly used for such purpose as you think proper," do you think they are going to reject that or be insulted by it? Is not that exactly what we are doing in India and Korea and China and South America, and is it not what we are doing exactly in our home mission fields, here in Georgia as well as in your own field? Of course, there is no insult in that. Whatever method is agreeable to them would be all right with me, and I would say to them, "You select your own method by which this shall be done." Let them understand that there is no politics of any kind in this thing. They don't want to be interfered with in their politics, and I don't wonder at it. I don't want to be interfered with in my politics by anybody, and I do not let anybody interfere with me in my politics; and I could not claim that right unless I should accord that right to others. You say, "Is there any likelihood that you can give the colored brethren a place in the reunited Church (I speak of it in that form because it was once a united Church), just the place that he has in your Church?" No, brethren, I do not see that it is possible. You say to me that we cannot set him aside. We do not ask you to set him aside. If there be law for the plan proposed here by Judge Rogers, there is a form of conference or conference relation that he could sustain in which there would be no breach of law. We had quite an essay on caste. What has caste to do with this? I said to you at Baltimore that in my

judgment no man could draw a color line through the field of justice. There is no color line there. No man can draw a color line through the field of kindness. There is no color line there. Where justice is due it must be paid to the man to whom it is due, and God holds that man responsible for the payment. Where kindness is due it must be shown to the man to whom it is due. God will hold that man responsible for a failure to pay that debt of kindness. But now, you come up and talk about privileges in the General Conference and place in the General Conference and on the Council to determine the laws. It is not acceptable to our brethren. I know some of the analogies that were brought out there. Do you tell me I am denying to the man who lives next door to me a right that is due him, if I do not agree to send him to Congress, or that he is denying me a right that is my due if he refuses to send me to Congress? Well, there are a good many men in Virginia and South Carolina who have been denied their right to get into Congress on that basis. I do not see that any right is denied them. When you tell them that they cannot occupy certain positions you are not denying them anything. They have been told that by action, if not in words, before, and never yet has the negro come to that one office that you brethren have in your Church with your two orders. He has the orders all right, but he lacks the office, and he is not going to get the office. I thought that was quite a piece of witticism, a brightness that had in it an illumination as well as hard common sense. Our Bishop Hoss was present at one of your General Conferences and was being very courteously cared for. Some lady who was near by when a negro was named for the episcopacy, and there was applause, turned to Bishop Hoss and said, "What do you think of that?" Bishop Hoss said, "I am entirely in accord with that. You have given him the applause and that is all you intend to give him." Of course, if there were an unchristian attitude I could not advocate it, and would not stand for it. If it were an unfair or an unjust thing or even if it were hedged about in a way to insult or belittle the negro brother, I would not stand for it; but I verily believe it opens the door to his larger usefulness, it opens the door to his larger hope, it opens the door to the larger development of his traits and characteristics and qualities which will be of value not only to us white brothers, but to the Church of God the wide world over, and it will help to open the door for the time when those who so reluctantly separated in 1844 will do the best they can at some unnamed date to come together again. I should like to have contributed more to this subject. I have spoken mainly because so many have asked me to speak, mostly my friends, our own men. There are other

points that are important in these negotiations that need to be dwelt upon, but this is the principal matter under discussion, and I have therefore confined myself to that one question. Hear a concluding statement that is not *cant*, that is not pretense. We are living in the day when, differing somewhat from our forefathers, there is an indisposition to speak often of the personal, spiritual side of our lives, and we have forgotten the language of the classroom, though some of us were there from early youth; but God knows that these brethren, who by the strange, mysterious workings of God were brought to this land, will under him be given their proper place. God grant that there may be kindled in their souls such a light of glory and there be opened to their means such a door of opportunity as may bring light to those that sit in darkness, and may the angels give glory, not only over one sinner that repenteth, but over unnumbered thousands who are brought into the kingdom of God.

Bishop Denny resumed the chair.

John M. Moore: The committee that was ordered by the Commission and appointed by the two separate committees is now ready to present its report, if it is the will of the Commission to receive it.

Edwin M. Randall: I move that the report of the committee be received and copies distributed and that it be made the order of the day immediately after the reading of the journal to-morrow morning. By "received" I mean also the reading of it.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

John M. Moore: This committee was constituted from the membership of the two committees, one on the Status of the Negro and the other on Conferences. To this committee were referred the two reports, the preferential and the alternative, that were presented by the Committee on the Status of the Negro and also the supplemental report brought in yesterday, and also the report that deals with this question as formulated by the Committee on Conferences. I think it is well for you to know that the committee appointed by the Committee on Conferences was composed of Dr. Blake, Mr. Simpson, Dr. Du Bose, and Dr. Hyer, and from the Committee on the Status of the Negro, Dr. Wallace, Mr. Brown, Dr. Snyder, and myself. We spent six and a half hours in formulating this report and we are glad to present it to you with the unanimous voice of the Committee of Eight. That does not mean that each of us approves every item in the report. There are things in there that some of us do not approve, yet nevertheless this whole report is the unanimous report of the Committee of Eight. Dr. Blake was

Secretary of the committee and had much to do with formulating the report and he will read it.

Edgar Blake: May I state, Mr. Chairman, that the report is numbered to take its place properly in the report of the Committee on Conferences which has already been adopted in part.

Dr. Blake then read the report, which appears in the proceedings of February 1, 1918, where it was again read.

The hymn, "There's a wideness in God's mercy," was sung, the benediction was pronounced by Bishop Denny, and the Commission adjourned.

NINTH DAY, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1918.

MORNING SESSION.

The Joint Commission met pursuant to adjournment and was called to order by Bishop Cranston.

Bishop Edwin D. Mouzon conducted the devotional exercises.

The hymn, "Faith of our fathers, living still," was sung.

Prayer was offered by Bishop Mouzon, who also read John xvii.

"All hail the power of Jesus' name" was sung.

Prayer was offered by Dr. A. J. Lamar.

Bishop Collins Denny took the chair as presiding officer.

The roll was called and the following were present: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke, Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. A. Candler, W. B. Murrah, James Atkins. Ministers: Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. J. Wallace, C. M. Stuart, F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, W. N. Ainsworth, H. M. Du Bose, A. J. Lamar. Laymen: G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock, M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White.

The minutes of yesterday afternoon's session were read and approved.

Bishop Cranston again took the chair as presiding officer.

John M. Moore: The report of the committee as corrected has been distributed and you will note on page 2, Section 4, the addition that was necessary in order to make the report as was intended:

Each Associate Regional Jurisdiction shall be entitled to be represented in the General Conference by five ministerial and five lay delegates, who shall be elected by its Associate Regional Conference at the regular meeting preceding the meeting of the General Conference.

If there is any question that any one would like to ask to get the exact meaning that we have in this report, I shall be glad to answer the question.

The report in full was as follows:

ART. VII. ASSOCIATE REGIONAL CONFERENCES.

Section 1. There shall be the following Associate Regional Jurisdictions, each having its own Associate Regional Conference:

(1) The Afro-American, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions composed of persons of African descent in the United States and in the continent of Africa.

(2) The Latin American, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in Latin American countries, including Porto Rico, Cuba, Mexico, Central America, and South America.

(3) The European, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in the countries of Europe, in the Madeira Islands, and in Africa, not otherwise provided for.

(4) The Eastern Asiatic, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in China, Korea, Philippine Islands, and Malaysia.

(5) The Southern Asiatic, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in India and Burma.

Sec. 2. *Members.*—Each Associate Regional Conference shall be composed as follows:

(1) One ministerial and one lay delegate from and elected by each Annual Conference, Mission Conference, and Mission of its jurisdiction for each 2,000 Church members in full connection or fraction thereof; *provided*, that each Annual Conference, Mission Conference, and Mission shall be entitled to one ministerial and one lay delegate.

(2) Ministerial delegates shall be elected by the ministerial members of the Annual Conference, Mission Conference, or Mission, and the lay delegates shall be elected by the lay members thereof.

(3) Ministerial delegates of an Associate Regional Conference shall be at least twenty-five years of age and shall have been members of an Annual Conference or Mission Conference for at least two years at the time of their election, and at the time of the session of the Associate Regional Conference shall be members of the Annual Conference, Mission Conference, or Mission which elected them.

(4) Lay delegates of an Associate Regional Conference shall be at least twenty-one years of age and shall have been members of the Methodist Church for at least two years, and at the time of their election and at the time of the session of the Associate Regional Conference shall be members of a pastoral charge within the bounds of the Annual Conference, Mission Conference, or Mission which elected them.

(5) Each Associate Regional Conference shall be the judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of its own members.

Sec. 3. *Area and Boundaries.*—The area and boundaries of Associate Regional Jurisdictions may be changed by a majority vote of the General Conference present and voting.

Sec. 4. *Privileges and Powers.*—Subject to the restrictions and limitations of this Constitution and to the rules and regulations adopted by the General Conference in relation to the connectional affairs of the Church,

each Associate Regional Conference having not less than 150,000 Church members in full connection shall have authority to legislate regarding the distinctively regional affairs of its area; and to elect from time to time the number of bishops allotted to it by the General Conference; subject, however, to their confirmation by the General Conference and to their consecration by the general superintendents. The powers and privileges of each Associate Regional Conference having less than 150,000 Church members in full connection shall be determined by the General Conference.

Each Associate Regional Jurisdiction shall be entitled to be represented in the General Conference by five ministerial and five lay delegates, who shall be elected by its Associate Regional Conference at the regular meeting preceding the meeting of the General Conference.

Sec. 5. *Meetings*.—(1) Each Associate Regional Conference shall meet not more than six nor less than three months in advance of the regular meeting of the General Conference, at such time and place as may be determined, and at such other times and places as it may itself determine. Special meetings of any Associate Regional Conference may be convened by the bishops of its jurisdiction and shall be convened whenever a majority of the Annual Conferences and Mission Conferences of the jurisdiction shall request such special session.

(2) The effective bishops resident within an Associate Regional Jurisdiction shall preside over the session of the Associate Regional Conference thereof, as said bishops may themselves determine; but if there shall be no bishop resident in the jurisdiction of said Conference at the time of its session, the general superintendents shall designate one of their number for such presidency.

ART. VIII. ASSOCIATE GENERAL CONFERENCE.

Any Associate Regional Conference by a majority vote of its members present and voting, with the concurrence of a majority of the members of the several Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions of its jurisdiction, present and voting, and with the approval of the General Conference, may become an Associate General Conference, and when it has 600,000 Church members in full connection shall become an Associate General Conference with the privileges and powers herein provided.

Section 1. *Members*.—An Associate General Conference shall be composed of an equal number of ministers and laymen to be chosen in such manner as said Associate General Conference may determine; *provided*, that each Annual Conference shall be entitled to one ministerial and one lay delegate; and *provided, further*, that the membership of an Associate General Conference shall not be less than 100 nor more than 300 ministers and laymen in equal numbers.

The first Associate General Conference shall be constituted in such manner as an Associate Regional Conference.

Sec. 2. *Powers*.—Subject to the restrictions and limitations of this Constitution, each Associate General Conference shall, so far as relates to its Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions, and the members thereof, have all the powers of the General Conference, legislative, executive, and judicial.

Provided, that an Associate General Conference shall not prescribe conditions, privileges, and duties of Church membership that are contrary to or in conflict with those prescribed by the General Conference, nor shall it define and fix powers, privileges, and duties of the episcopacy contrary to or in conflict with the powers, privileges, and duties of the episcopacy as defined and fixed by the General Conference.

Sec. 3. *Privileges*.—An Associate General Conference shall be entitled:

(1) To elect one member of the Constitutional Council as herein provided.

(2) To have representation proportionate to membership on all distinctively connectional boards or societies of the Church in which its interests are involved.

(3) To elect not exceeding five ministerial and five lay representatives to the General Conference, who shall have the right to speak in the General Conference and in its standing committees on all matters which relate to and affect the interests of the jurisdictions which they represent; but said representatives shall not have the right to vote.

And the General Conference may elect not exceeding five ministerial and five lay representatives to an Associate General Conference, and said representatives shall be entitled to speak on all distinctively local matters; but they shall not have the right to vote in an Associate Regional Conference.

(4) To share proportionately in the proceeds of the Book Concern or Publishing House.

Sec. 4. *Meetings.*—An Associate General Conference shall meet quadrennially and at such other times and at such places as it may determine.

It shall be governed by such rules of procedure as it may itself prescribe.

Recommendations.

1. We recommend that, following the adoption of this Constitution, or within four years thereafter, the status of the Afro-American Jurisdiction be submitted to the Annual and Lay Conferences of said jurisdiction for determination; and if a majority of the members of said Annual and Lay Conferences, present and voting, shall elect to accept the status of an Associate General Conference, said jurisdiction shall be recognized as such with all the privileges and powers of the same, otherwise the Afro-American Jurisdiction shall be recognized as an Associate Regional Conference.

2. We recommend that in organizing the Afro-American Associate Regional Conference or the Afro-American Associate General Conference the Commission invite the membership of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church and such other Methodist Episcopal Church organizations composed of members of African descent to consider the feasibility and desirability of uniting themselves in the proposed organization.

Edwin M. Randall: There are here what may require a series of questions to be asked, but they all may be comprehended in one request. There are a number of items in this report that must have been understood much better by the committee than they can be by the rest of us. For instance, it says under "Privileges and Powers," Section 4:

Subject to the restrictions and limitations of this Constitution and to the rules and regulations adopted by the General Conference in relation to the connectional affairs of the Church, each Associate Regional Conference having not less than 150,000 Church members in full connection shall have authority, etc.

Further on in that section it says also:

The powers and privileges of each Associate Regional Conference having less than 150,000 Church members in full connection shall be determined by the General Conference.

I take it for granted that in regard to that, and in regard to sim-

ilar passages that may be found elsewhere, the members of the committee had before them facts that certainly would have been gathered when we remember the characteristic thoroughness of the men on that committee, facts that enabled them to know, as many of us do not know, just how the selection of such figures affects the situation in our various fields—that is, considering the combined strength of the two Churches in Eastern Asia, what is the relation of that combined strength to this limitation? How does it appear in Southern Asia? Why were these figures adopted, and what are the immediate and prospective results?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): If you are making a speech on the merits of the question, I take it that you are in order, because it is in the order of the day; but all these facts will come out in the general discussion of the report.

Edwin M. Randall: To come to my conclusion, I think, without waiting for the discussion to bring it out, it would save time if some one of the committee might go over the report and give something in the way of an exposition.

Bishop McDowell: Dr. Randall was entirely within the parliamentary situation that was before the house. Dr. Moore has just said that if there were any questions for information he would be glad to answer them, and Dr. Randall was asking such a question.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The Chair is not disputing that; but the question was beginning to be in the nature of a discussion as to the merits.

John M. Moore: We consider that all these inquiries are in order and we are happy to give the information that Dr. Randall desires. Dr. Blake has this information, and I shall ask him to give it to the Commission.

E. B. Chappell: I suggest that Dr. Blake run through the report and give us a commentary as we go along.

Edgar Blake: This is not my report; this is a combination of various reports and suggestions brought here, and I would not be competent to go through it all.

E. B. Chappell: You are on the committee.

Edgar Blake: I am, but there are other members of the committee much more competent to do that than I am.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): It is very evident that we are wasting considerable time.

E. B. Chappell: If you will pardon me, I think the request of Dr. Randall is a wise one, and rather necessary. There are certain data that should be before us before we begin the discussion to-day. For instance, we ought to know how many mem-

bers will be found in these several Associate Regional Jurisdictions and other information of that character.

Edwin M. Randall: I make the suggestion that Dr. Blake shall represent the committee in such a running comment as has been requested; and inasmuch as the report is composite and represents several committees' work, if at any time on any part of the report some member of another committee or some member of this committee may be able to impart information that in the nature of the case Dr. Blake does not possess, such person shall be given an opportunity to discuss that part of the report for us.

Edgar Blake: In the Committee on Conferences, acting under the resolution passed by the Joint Commission, I was authorized and instructed to gather certain statistical data that affect our Regional Conferences and our Associate Regional Conferences. Those facts have been secured, and if permitted I shall be glad to present them at this time, but I am not competent to give a running comment upon this report. Dr. Moore and others who have served from the beginning on the Committee on the Status of the Negro are much more competent to do that, as this is a report from that committee. If you are willing, I will give you certain facts. May I ask you to make notation under Article VII.:

Section 1. There shall be the following Associate Regional Jurisdictions, each having its own Associate Regional Conference:

(1) The Afro-American, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions composed of persons of African descent in the United States and in the continent of Africa.

I have the figures on that which I will give you in a moment, when I find them.

E. B. Chappell: While Dr. Blake is looking for his figures, may I make a statement? I was not here when the roll was called. Mr. Maddin was called away last night by the severe illness of a nephew in the camp at Macon, Ga. He will try to get back in the morning, but he wanted to be excused for to-day.

The leave of absence was granted.

Edgar Blake: The colored jurisdiction would have a total membership in full connection of 315,517. These figures are taken from the General Minutes of 1916. When they were made the General Minutes for 1917 were not available, and they are not now available; all statistics are, therefore, upon the returns of 1916.

Edwin M. Randall: Does that include all the missions in Africa of both Churches?

Edgar Blake: So far as we have them it includes Africa and Liberia.

Bishop Denny: Does that include probationers?

Edgar Blake: It does not include probationers. It is the number of members in full connection.

T. N. Ivey: I did not catch whether that included our mission members in Africa?

John F. Goucher: It would not make a difference of 100.

Edgar Blake: The membership of the Congo Mission of the Church, South, is thirty-two.

T. N. Ivey: I was not asking for members, but whether that is the right combination. That was my point.

Edgar Blake: The members of the Congo Mission are included. The second subsection:

(2) The Latin American, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in Latin American countries, including Porto Rico, Cuba, Mexico, Central America, and South America.

30,657 full members in both Churches.

W. N. Ainsworth: I think I discover a slight inaccuracy that ought to be corrected in that paragraph. There are certain Conferences and missionary work among the Mexican people within the territory of the United States, and that is not specifically included in this paragraph.

E. B. Chappell: No foreign people in the United States are included in this and they are not to be separated that way. They are meant to be included in the Conferences in the United States, as I understand. In other words, we do not want to classify our Mexicans in the United States in Mexico; we want to keep them connected with us in the United States always.

W. N. Ainsworth: That is a question, of course, for the best judgment of this body, but it occurs to me that the Mexican work that we have within the State of Texas and in the Southern part of New Mexico, and perhaps stretching into Southern California, would be properly included with the work we have among the Mexicans in the Republic of Mexico.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That is a question that will depend for its answer on the turn the discussion takes. Dr. Blake will proceed.

Edgar Blake (Reading):

(3) The European, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in the countries of Europe, in the Madeira Islands, and in Africa, not otherwise provided for.

That embraces 64,019 Church members in full connection.

Edgar M. Randall: Might I ask whether Dr. Blake can give

us the membership of the Mexican Conferences within the United States?

Edgar Blake: I can; but would it not be better to postpone that until I get through with this? All that information is available.

Albert J. Nast: May I ask Dr. Blake the total figures for this Regional Jurisdiction in Europe? I understood him to say 64,019. Does that include probationers?

Edgar Blake: We are discussing now only members in full connection. I can give you the facts as to probationers if you want them later. (Reading):

(4) The Eastern Asiatic, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in China, Korea, Philippine Islands, and Malaysia.

That will embrace 66,608. (Reading):

(5) The Southern Asiatic, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in India and Burma.

This embraces 59,630 full members.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Both Churches?

Edgar Blake: Yes.

George Warren Brown: Did I understand that those were all from the data of 1916?

Edgar Blake: All from the General Minutes of 1916. Now, we come to the number of delegates in the Associate Regional Conferences:

Sec. 2. Each Associate Regional Conference shall be composed as follows:

(1) One ministerial and one lay delegate from and elected by each Annual Conference, Mission Conference, and Mission of its jurisdiction for each 2,000 Church members in full connection or fraction of two-thirds thereof; *provided*, that each Annual Conference, Mission Conference, and Mission shall be entitled to one ministerial and one lay delegate.

John M. Moore: An easy way to arrive at the number of delegates would be to divide by two and cut off the last two figures.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: That will not work out.

Edwin M. Randall: It will work out a little more than that, but will not affect it materially.

Edgar Blake: I can give you the exact figures. The African Associate Regional Conference would be 308.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Delegates?

Edgar Blake: Yes, in their Associate Regional Conference. Number 2, the Latin American, would have 36. The European would have 82, Eastern Asia would have 68, and Southern Asia would have 62.

Edwin M. Randall: May I ask why in each field except the first we have the resulting number of delegates in excess of the number of thousands owing to representation guaranteed to the small Conferences, while in the first, notwithstanding the delegations guaranteed to the small Conferences, we have a less number of delegates than the number of thousands?

Edgar Blake: The reason for that is that we have certain Missions that have less than 1,000 members and they get two delegates.

Edwin M. Randall: That would explain the increase in the number of delegates over the number of thousands in all but the first, notwithstanding that occasion for an increased number there are but 308 delegates reported for 315,000.

Edgar Blake: May I call attention to the fact that in the Afro-American there is no Mission Conference that has fewer than 2,000 members?

E. B. Chappell: That is accounted for by the losses less than two-thirds.

Edwin M. Randall: The losses on account of fractions.

David G. Downey: Why is this, No. 3 with 64,000 has 82, and No. 4 with 66,000 has only 68?

Edgar Blake: That is due to the excess they have above 2,000. The matter is worked out in detail.

John F. Goucher: May we have the number of probationers also?

Edgar Blake: I will give the probationers: No. 1, 36,094; No. 2, 10,814; No. 3, 18,698; No. 4, 45,302; No. 5, 142,243.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Are you sure of those, Doctor?

Edgar Blake: Sure of all of them.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): What is the pleasure of the Commission? Is there any motion about this report?

John M. Moore: If there is any other question any one desires to ask about any part of it, we shall be glad to answer. I hardly know what action you desire. I do not know whether you want to take this up and discuss it item by item, or whether you want to discuss it as a whole, or whether you want to take action item by item, or wait until you discuss it and then come back and act. That is for this body to determine. I want to say that your committee has done its utmost to find a middle ground for action. I suppose there is not a man in the eight, and perhaps not a man in this Commission, that would indorse everything in this report. If he had his own way, there would be no way; but the committee is of the opinion that it would be very hard, if not impossible, to change very much of it, as it relates to the negro, without interfering with some

views held by some members of this Commission. We have done our best to harmonize the reports that were before us. Of course, we have not all the wisdom, but all the wisdom we have we have used in formulating this report. We have tried to be truly and absolutely fair in dealing with the two Jurisdictions in bringing this report to you. I know very well that the Commissioners from the Methodist Episcopal Church would prefer things differently, because they have said again and again that they would like to have the Major Regional Conferences. Our associates have said that they would like to have the independent Church. Neither of those is possible. To insist upon either by either side means complete failure—that we cannot go on. Then the next question that came, as pointed out by Dr. Blake, was whether we would have the separate General Conference, or whether we would have the Associate Regional Conferences with limited representation for the negroes in the General Conference. These two did not bring us together. We have tried to harmonize them by putting the negro into an Associate Regional Conference, and yet making provision for the Associate General Conference when a certain state of development has been reached. We have combined these to the very best of our ability, and I am inclined to think that it comes as near representing the synthetic judgment of the committee as can be reached at all. I realize that we might want to leave out the representation in the General Conference; but if that were done, it disturbs the equilibrium that we have been able to bring about by bringing in the Associate Regional Conference. So it is with other things we have tried to bring in a balanced report. So far as the negro is concerned I know this is not altogether satisfactory to him. I know that the two Commissions could not say that it was altogether satisfactory to them, so that we have made it possible to submit the question of their relation to them under two different forms, giving them the right of choice. Somebody said we should not put in the invitation to the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church to join with us. We think that should go in for this reason: The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, does have a very sacred relation to this Church. We all recognize that. It is not possible for our people to turn away from some sort of support to the membership of that Church. Of course, we have provisions through our Major Regional Conferences for giving that support. I cannot understand that there can be any law passed that would keep us from bestowing our benefactions from the Southern Regional Conferences if we desire to do so; that is, being a distinctly regional matter we can do that; but while we can do that, we feel that in harmony with the Chattanooga sug-

gestions we should invite specifically this Church, and then embrace in that invitation the other negro organizations. We cannot speak for the other denominations. That would not be fair to them. We are not authorized. But we are speaking for ourselves and we extend an invitation to them to become a part of this organization. I will say that the committee has acted unanimously. We stand behind this report, believing this is the best we can work out. That does not mean that we are not open to suggestions. There are questions that relate to the Conference itself, or polity and organization, that you can raise and alterations that you might make that would improve this report, and that is proper in perfecting the instrument; but so far as the Status of the Negro is concerned in the Church it seems to us that we have given you a balanced report as nearly as we were able to make it so.

C. M. Bishop: I want to ask a question of Dr. Moore concerning the last page, the final words of the second paragraph. Is it correctly put when you say "Associate Regional Conference"? Should not that be Associate General Conference?

John M. Moore: No, we say that in organizing the Afro-American Associate Regional Conference or the Afro-American General Conference we shall invite the membership of the Colored Methodist Church, etc.

C. M. Bishop: I am referring to the fourth page.

John M. Moore: I am referring to the fourth page also.

C. M. Bishop: The second paragraph.

John M. Moore: That is the second paragraph.

C. M. Bishop: You are evidently not referring to the same place that I am. Here is what I am referring to:

And the General Conference may elect not exceeding five ministerial and five lay representatives to an Associate General Conference, and said representatives shall be entitled to speak on all distinctively connectional matters, but they shall not have the right to vote in an Associate Regional Conference.

John M. Moore: You are right; we meant Associate General Conference.

Charles A. Pollock: I move that we consider this report item by item.

The motion was seconded.

A. J. Lamar: Does that look to the disposition of each item after discussion by vote? If it does, I shall oppose it, but if you want to discuss it item by item I have no objection.

Edgar Blake: I see no reason why this report might not follow the form the other reports have done. We have taken up other reports and have gone through them item by item and have sought to reach tentative agreements on the several matters

with the understanding always that the reports are completed item by item and such agreements have been reached and that then before final action is taken they will have to be submitted to the separate Commissions for their judgment or the judgment of a majority of each Commission. It seems to me the wise thing for us to do is as far as possible to go through, and if we can complete the report or perfect it, do so, and then after we have perfected it to go to the Commissions and let them act upon it and say whether they approve the report tentatively agreed upon.

Charles A. Pollock: That is my idea exactly. Some of us have some business engagements at home that will not permit us to remain here any great length of time beyond this week, and unless we get down to business here pretty soon I am afraid there will be some vacant seats. I think we have discussed this matter now so that we can talk about the items. We possibly may be opposed to the general plan, but may not be opposed to some particular item in this report. Dr. Blake has suggested, as this whole matter will have to be referred for a general vote to the separate Commissions, we might go on now and tentatively pass on these items.

Charles M. Bishop: I wish to raise the question of whether it is wise for us to undertake to discuss so long a report with so many items, item by item. I am perfectly sure we are all aware of the fact that the masters of language and grammar are on the lookout for an opportunity and that our past experience would justify us in calculating that it would take two or three days probably to settle this matter item by item unless we begin with the view that on the whole it is the best thing that could be done, so why may we not agree generally to accept the items and discuss the general phases? and if we are to do that, would it not be wise at this time for our separate Commissions to meet in separate sessions and discuss whether we can agree as to the principles involved and whether there would be any final clash between the two Commissions? If not, then we can perfect the items; otherwise, we might leave a small committee to perfect all the items, and if we have finally to disagree concerning the principles that have been worked out and the compromises that have been agreed to by the representative men of each Commission—if we are finally to disagree about that, why waste time upon the items? I, therefore, beg to offer as a substitute that the Joint Commission will now adjourn and that the separate Commissions will now meet for the consideration of this report, to come together again at the call of the Chairmen of the two Commissions.

The motion was seconded.

Claudius B. Spencer: I understand that a report of the Committee on Conferences is ready to be submitted, and that it is printed in some such form as this. It seems that when we have these matters before us as Commissions, we should have the largest amount of information we can get; and having had an opportunity of running over that printed report in a most desultory manner, I would very much indeed like to have them in my hands at the same time that I have this, and I would beg to move and relate this to Dr. Bishop's motion that copies of that report be distributed to the members of the Joint Commission, so that if the two do interbraid we can have the whole matter before the two Commissions when we meet.

The motion was seconded.

Rolla V. Watt: I probably am in a hopeless minority, but I do not even object to that. I feel that we will not get anywhere by having separate meetings of the Commissions. We know there are items in the report not acceptable to either side, that it is a compromise measure; and I think we shall get along better if we discuss these differences face to face, and see how nearly we can agree. Then, if we separate, each side may consider what it will or will not accept. We tried separate discussions at Traverse City and did not get anywhere. We made fine progress when we were face to face, and I hope we shall stay here together and take up this report *seriatim* and fight it out; and if we do not come to a conclusion, it will not be because we have not tried.

George Warren Brown: My mind has run along the same line as Brother Watt's in that connection. I believe we should get the slant of each other as a Joint Commission on this general proposition before we separate. Of course, we are going to separate and take these items up by the two Commissions separately, but at first we should know the minds of our brethren on the other side. We have nothing to lose and everything to gain in my judgment by having a general discussion.

John F. Goucher: I think there is a privileged question: I should like to move to adopt the report; unless that motion is before us we have nothing before us.

Bishop McDowell: Of course, Dr. Goucher means that that particular motion should have been preceded by the general motion to adopt the report.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I took it that the *seriatim* motion was really a motion to adopt by that process.

C. M. Bishop: I would like to have unanimous consent to have my motion acted upon. It has been seconded.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Is there unanimous consent given? There is, and the motion is before us for debate.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: What does the adoption of the motion mean? What does "adoption" mean? If you "adopt" a report, you adopt the substance of it. If the gentlemen are ready to adopt, I am ready to adopt it.

C. M. Bishop: We do not intend to adopt it. It is simply a motion made to adopt.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The motion is to adopt, and the next motion would be to consider the report *seriatim*, and the next motion would be various motions on the various items. Let that take precedence in the journal; and then comes Judge Pollock's motion, and then the motion of Dr. Bishop that the Commissions meet separately, and then Dr. Spencer's motion to be held back for the time being.

Claudius B. Spencer: All right.

Edgar Blake: My objection to the two Commissions' meeting separately for the consideration of these reports, or, rather, to caucus on these reports, is this: That the information or the point of view that will come before each Commission will be only partial. This Committee of Eight would never have gotten together had the four members of the Church, South, met by themselves and the four Commissioners from the Church, North, met by themselves and considered these matters separately. It was only because we sat down together and talked the thing out and caught each other's spirit and got each other's point of view that we were able to reach an agreement. If you Southern members go apart by yourselves and discuss these questions, some one will say, "How do the Northern brothers feel about that?" And then some one in your Commission will say, "I talked with so and so, one of the Northern brothers, and he said so and so," and you accept that as the mind of our Commission and we do the same thing. Matters are only partially before us. But when we come together and discuss matters and get each other's point of view and catch each other's spirit it is vastly easier to agree. For that reason I hope the preliminary discussion will come in the Joint Commission. It is as Mr. Watt said, when we hold separate sessions we get nowhere. We wouldn't be anywhere to-day if we had kept on holding separate sessions. It was only because we met together that we have reached conclusions. We'll get along much more rapidly if we consider all matters in joint session.

A. F. Watkins: The most substantial work that this Commission has done in our three meetings has been as the result of joint conferences rather than sectional conferences. In the very nature of the case when we meet in sections we see clearly from our point of view. I do not believe that it has made for progress to have too early and too frequent sectional meetings.

We have agreed here with great brotherliness that we would consider these reports item by item and reach tentative conclusions. No one supposes for a moment that the reports that have been adopted have been adopted in any final way. We have not agreed upon any single item; and that is not to be done, I understand, until there has been a consideration of the completed work by the sections of the Commission. If we separate, it would be, in fact, the report made by this Joint Committee to the separate Commissions. They have not made this report to the separate Commissions; they have made it to the Joint Commission. The report in our joint consideration will be affected somewhat. There will be modifications suggested and there will be some modifications that will probably be made. When they have been made, we have reached a joint conviction of opinion of the Commission. As to the very words themselves, as to the modification of meanings, we shall be prepared to know the spirit of our brethren from the South and of our brethren from the North, to act upon this matter, and it will be entirely proper and very desirable that we do so at that time; but is it not proper that the joint wisdom of the two sections should be brought to bear now upon this report made by the representatives of the two Commissions and made to the Joint Commission in order that, going over it carefully and timely and in the spirit of compromise, we reach a conclusion that can be reached by joint consideration? And when we have gotten the last word, the last expression of varying opinion, the last tentative conviction reached by the Commission as a unit, then, and not until then, are we prepared to go aside and say each for himself, "Are we prepared to say this thing is well?" If not, in what respect are we not, and may we not modify it so that we might, when we afterwards come back together, suggest some little change that might possibly be made? But suppose that we separate now, and go to the consideration even tentatively of this report, we might as well have had the two Commissions meeting separately at the start and attempting to reach by themselves some solution of this problem, instead of having these eight gentlemen here working all day and all night for the last two days, because the Commissions themselves in separate session will necessarily take a sectional view of the matter instead of getting the benefit of the spirit of compromise and the spirit of willingness that come from brotherly consideration of this report, modifying it if necessary in words or in sentiment. Not until we do that are we prepared as representatives of either section to say that we will indorse this or that we will indorse that, or whether we will accept this without change or whether we will make certain modifications; and if we

decide to make some modification we will go back and discuss the modification and see if we cannot reach an agreement. I do not think separation at this moment will make progress.

C. M. Bishop: All are aiming at the same thing, to get this work done and well done. Suggestions that we are about to disband come not only publicly but privately all around. That ought not to be. I hope we can stay; but it seems to me that we have come to understand each other's minds rather clearly, that we were right at the point, when this subcommittee was appointed, where we could see the way out by the aid of the subcommittee. So far as I am concerned, it is not my view at all that the separate Commissions should change the committee's plan, but that they should see if we can carry it out, see how nearly we can come to bringing our Commissions each to the acceptance of this particular plan. We will have nothing to do at all unless and until both Commissions are ready to accept the plan proposed. We have discussed every matter involved, with the exception of certain details. The impression made by the addresses of Judge Rogers and Dr. Blake was so powerful that immediately it was the universal disposition to put the whole matter in the hands of four men from each Commission now to work it out. They have worked it out. They have discussed every question that can come before us. Why go over the whole matter again in this larger body of fifty, forty-two of whom will be wanting to speak about it? Let us go apart and let each Commission do its best to reach a conclusion. If either Commission cannot accede to this, let them report on what they fail to accept, and say we can go so far on this and no farther. So also with the other Commission, then we will at least have discovered what we can agree to and have reduced to a minimum the matters on which we differ; and, if necessary, some other form can be discussed and submitted.

Abram W. Harris: I favor the motion to adjourn in order to allow us to deliberate as two Commissions. If our train of thought requires forty-two speeches, it will be an advantage to run it in two sections.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: You are the only one that talked two days.

Abram W. Harris: The parallel between committees and commissions is not a true one. If you have a misunderstanding with your wife, and you are wise, you talk it over with her alone before you call in your relations. Then again, I'd like to provide a chance for denaturing our speeches before they are delivered here. What did we appoint the Committee of Eight for? To facilitate business. When we try to handle details as

a Commission of fifty, we go too slow; there are too many of us.

David G. Downey: I do not care particularly whether we discuss this matter in separate sections or together. The thing I am anxious for is that we shall not waste time on the non-essentials. The time has come when we should get down to the things that are of real importance. To tell you the truth, I am a little weary of tentative discussions and tentative agreements that land us nowhere. We have talked many days and we haven't yet agreed on any one thing. Nothing is settled; everything is in the air. The problem that is before us, the question for agreement, is contained practically in two paragraphs, Article VII., Section 4, the Privileges and Powers of the Associate Regional Conferences, and Article VIII., by itself, not a numbered section. There are the two vital things. There has been a lot of time wasted discussing the minutiae of all these individual preliminaries, wasting time upon little points of order, little points of rhetoric, little points of grammar, leaving untouched the real central things that will decide everything else. If we can agree on these two central things to which reference has been made, we can settle everything in this report; and if we do not, what boots it that we settled the other minor things? Whether in joint or separate sections, let us come close to the heart of this problem at once and settle up those two matters.

E. B. Chappell: My friend Dr. Harris got ahead of me. He has had his speech and I have not had mine. I want to say this—it will take only a moment: It is perfectly apparent, and we had as well face the facts, that this Commission cannot accept this in the main outline, that we cannot get together, and we might as well go apart and say whether we can accept it. If we cannot accept this in the main outline, we cannot get together. Let us go apart in our separate rooms and determine whether we can in the main outlines accept this report.

W. N. Ainsworth: I move the previous question.

The motion was seconded.

C. M. Bishop: A question of privilege: A previous question would demand the putting of a vote.

W. N. Ainsworth: I have used that motion in the sense of which we of our General Conference use it. I want to see the question under discussion.

John F. Gouchèr: I move that we adjourn.

The motion was seconded.

Frank M. Thomas: I call attention to the fact that Dr. Spencer's motion, which was seconded, in a sense has right of way in this matter. He moved that the report of the Committee on

Conferences be read and distributed to the members before we separate.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): That other question did relate to the privilege of the house, but this motion does not.

John F. Goucher: I am willing to change my motion that when we adjourn we adjourn until to-morrow morning.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Let us use a little informality and straighten things out. Is that report ready in printed form?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: It is in print.

A. J. Lamar: Under the rules governing our Southern General Conference we have not only a motion for a previous question, but for the pending question. If we vote the previous question, it means the whole subject shall be taken up in the parliamentary situation as it is and voted through to the end. If we vote the pending question, the adoption of that simply means voting on the immediate and subsidiary question which comes first. I suggest, in view of the fact that we have no pending question in this body, and I believe your Northern General Conference has not, that it would be better for Dr. Ainsworth to withdraw that motion.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): I don't believe it was seconded, anyhow.

John F. Goucher: I rise to a point of order, that a motion to adjourn is not the subject of discussion unless to a specific time. And now, I should like the privilege by consent to change the motion to adjourn and make it subject to the call of the two Chairmen.

C. M. Bishop: That was my motion.

W. N. Ainsworth: I thought the immediately pending motion was that we adjourn subject to the call of the two Chairmen. Was I correct on that? And on that I moved the previous question.

Edgar Blake: If you adjourn to meet at the call of the Chairmen, that means that each Chairman would have to see to it that the twenty-five members of his Commission are notified. Some of them are quite widely separated in their places of entertainment. It seems to me it would be far wiser to adjourn to a definite time. It does not appear that we could possibly get together this afternoon at three o'clock; we might get together to-morrow morning by the regular time, nine-thirty, but it would be far more convenient to adjourn to a fixed time, then we shall all know when and where we are expected to come together.

Rolla V. Watt: I take it that Dr. Goucher's motion is very adroit and at the same time a parliamentary method of showing,

in spite of the call for the previous question, that he is in favor of separate meetings of the Commission, and for that reason I object to an adjournment at this time.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): There seem to be two rules relating to the previous question. The rule of the Methodist Episcopal Church General Conference is different from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, General Conference. Without the assistance of the Committee on Rules of Order the Chair would be at a loss how to adjust it, but I suggest that a vote on the motion to adjourn would show—

Bishop Atkins: Is that motion subject to amendment?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Sure.

Bishop Atkins: I move to strike out "at the call of the Chairmen" and insert "to-morrow at nine-thirty."

John F. Goucher: I accept that.

A. J. Lamar: In the interest of the economy of time, I wish to suggest this: Why should we not meet in this building, one Commission in that room and one in this room, and hold our meetings here this afternoon at three o'clock, and if we do not finish we can then adjourn? But we will be in touch with each other and we can then meet whenever we are ready.

C. M. Bishop: Can a substitute be offered for the original motion?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The motion can take the ordinary course.

C. M. Bishop: If we adjourn now, with the parliamentary situation as it is, we shall be under the necessity of voting on the previous question the first thing when we come together.

W. N. Ainsworth: I withdraw the motion with the consent of the body, which I made for the previous question, assuming that you will now vote on the other question.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Then the vote is on Dr. Goucher's motion as amended by Bishop Atkins.

E. B. Chappell: Why not make it at three o'clock? Meet and have devotional services and then separate and come together when called.

John F. Goucher: Then I will withdraw the other motion and move that we adjourn until three o'clock.

Bishop Atkins: I withdraw my substitute.

A vote being taken, the motion to adjourn until three o'clock was carried.

Bishop McDowell: For the privilege of the house a request has been made for a printed report of the Committee on Conferences. That report is not in print.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Yes, it is.

Bishop McDowell: That report is not yet completed and can-

not, therefore, be furnished to you in a completed form. You have before you in typewritten form the proposals that have been made by the subcommittee which have not been acted upon by the full committee.

Dr. Ainsworth made various announcements.

Frank M. Thomas: I want to read one verse from one of our oldest missionaries: "I shudder to think of the result if we fail to follow what I feel to be the leadings of God's Spirit in the wonderful crisis before us."

The meeting was dismissed with benediction by Dr. J. J. Wallace.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Joint Commission met pursuant to adjournment and was called to order by Bishop McDowell.

The hymn, "I love thy kingdom, Lord," was sung.

Responsive service was had.

Prayer was offered by Rev. J. H. Reynolds.

The roll was called and the following were present: Bishops Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. B. Murrah, W. A. Candler, James Atkins, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Ministers: F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar, Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. J. Wallace, C. M. Stuart. Laymen: M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White, G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock.

The minutes of the morning session were read, corrected, and approved.

John M. Moore: I move that we adjourn until nine-thirty to-morrow morning unless called earlier by action of the two Chairmen.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Bishop Atkins: I think the reason for this early adjournment should be stated.

The Chairman (Bishop McDowell): It is so that the Commissions can meet separately.

John M. Moore: That may appear in the motion.

The Commission was dismissed with prayer and benediction by Rev. R. E. Jones.

TENTH DAY, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1918.

MORNING SESSION.

The Joint Commission was called to order by Bishop Earl Cranston.

The hymn, "Saviour, like a shepherd lead us," was sung.

Prayer was offered by Mr. M. L. Walton and also by Bishop Cooke.

The thirteenth chapter of John was read.

The hymn, "I love thy kingdom, Lord," was sung.

Dr. R. S. Hyer offered prayer.

The hymn, "Lead on, O King Eternal," was sung.

Rev. John F. Goucher offered prayer.

The journal of yesterday was read and approved.

The roll was called and the following were present: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke, Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. B. Murrah, James Atkins. Ministers: Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. J. Wallace, C. M. Stuart, F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar. Laymen: G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock, M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White.

Bishop Denny took the chair as presiding officer.

T. D. Samford: Mr. Chairman, a matter of personal privilege: Unfortunately for me, so far as my relations to this Commission are concerned, I hold an official position which necessitates my asking for leave of absence after to-day. I have submitted the matter to the Commission of my own Church and that Commission has granted me unanimous consent to ask leave of absence of this Joint Commission. I also ask the same privilege that was accorded to Judge Roberts, that I may leave my vote with some member of my Commission.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): You have heard the request. What is the pleasure of the body?

Bishop McDowell: I move that the request be granted.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

T. D. Samford: I shall ask Bishop Denny to cast my vote.

Bishop Murrah: It is necessary for me to make the same request. I am compelled to go to Greenville, S. C., to fulfill an

engagement there, and it will not be convenient for me to return. I must leave very soon to fill that engagement, and I ask leave of absence.

Bishop Atkins: I am ashamed to put in a third request of that same kind.

Bishop McDowell: I just move that we excuse the whole Southern Commission, so that we can go on and do the business.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I shall not entertain any such generous motion.

Bishop Atkins: I had hoped that I could be here until the final Amen was said, and I regret exceedingly that I must go. I did not know of this until yesterday afternoon over long distance phone, but it is necessary that I go to Washington City at once on very important matters. Otherwise, I would not leave until the final benediction was pronounced. This is the first meeting of this Joint Commission that I have attended, and I want to tell you how extremely I have enjoyed it. It has raised a doubt in my mind as to whether fifty such men ever got together before in a Christian Church. I have appreciated and thoroughly enjoyed every hour of association with you, even in this difficult work. I ask that some one cast my vote, and I record the prayer that God may be with you until the end, and that you may reach the right end.

John F. Goucher: I move that the request of Bishop Atkins be granted.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

H. H. White: I shall have to make the same request, although I may receive advices that may allow me to remain over until Monday. I wired to try to get some cases continued that are coming up, and if I get advices that they are continued I shall stay until Monday evening, with the privilege of leaving my vote with Bishop Denny.

Bishop McDowell: Evidently the general motion I made is not going to be necessary.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I did not know that all these requests were coming.

Bishop McDowell: I am going to move that the request of Judge White be granted. Now touching the matter that has often been mentioned, I would like to know how many men on this Commission have sons in the army or navy.

T. D. Samford: I have a boy that I raised.

Bishop McDowell: I would like a poll to be taken and see how many members of this Commission have sons, grandsons, or sons-in-law in the army or navy.

Abram W. Harris: Do you count the Y. M. C. A. work in that?

Bishop McDowell: I had in mind the actual fighting service.

A poll was taken and it resulted as follows: Bishop Cranston, 1; Bishop Hamilton, 1; Bishop Cooke, 2; Rev. Edgar Blake, 2; Rev. David G. Downey, 1; Rev. Edwin M. Randall, 1; Rev. Joseph W. Van Cleve, 1; Mr. Charles W. Fairbanks, 1; Bishop Atkins, 1; Rev. C. M. Bishop, 1; Rev. A. F. Watkins, 2; Rev. W. N. Ainsworth, 2; Judge M. L. Walton, 1; Mr. Maddin, a nephew, but no son; Mr. Hyer, a son and a son-in-law; Mr. T. D. Samford, a boy raised by him; Mr. J. R. Pepper, a nephew; Mr. E. C. Reeves, 1; Judge H. H. White, 2 sons and a son-in-law; Bishop Murrah, 1. Total, 26.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): And may God Almighty protect them all. I will put the motion about Brother White, which was not put. If you will grant Judge White leave of absence, so indicate.

The motion was carried.

Bishop Candler: I doubt, in the critical condition I was in, whether I should have come, but I hoped that farther South than Atlanta would relieve me; however, the moisture of this coast city has acted adversely, and I think I ought to return home, and I shall ask leave of absence with the privilege of leaving my vote with Bishop Denny.

Bishop Cranston: We have been exceedingly glad to see the face of Bishop Candler, although we could not hear his voice; and in moving that his request be granted, I wish to assure him of our prayers and of our thoughts for him and for his family.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

P. D. Maddin: Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to make a similar request. After the meeting at Traverse City, I made arrangements to give two weeks to this meeting, but, as some of you know, on November 14 I was appointed to a commission in the War Department as Chairman of the State Legal Advisory Board of Tennessee, and requested to enter immediately upon the discharge of the duties. From that date until coming here I gave all my time to this government work. My personal business has had practically no attention for eleven weeks. I secured a leave of absence to attend this meeting, but that leave has expired, and I do not feel justified in asking a continuance of it. I must therefore ask the Commission to excuse me after to-day's session. In taking my departure I want to say a word: I do not feel that there is any doubt that we shall come together and that unification will follow the efforts of this Commission.

It may not come immediately. It may take some time, but it is sure to come. There are adjustments in our plans that must be made and conditions that have to be met. We are anxious to meet them. I sincerely hope that our labors will result satisfactorily to our Church and for the benefit of the cause for which we all stand.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I happen to know of the urgency of Mr. Maddin's business, and I hope that you will excuse him and allow him to attend to it.

P. D. Maddin: I would like permission to leave my vote with Bishop Denny. On yesterday my nephew was so very sick that I had to go to him, but he is much improved and his father has arrived and the surgeons told us last night that he would escape pneumonia, and there was no necessity for my remaining longer.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Thank the Good Lord for the word about the boy.

A vote being taken, the motion to excuse Mr. Maddin was carried.

Frank M. Thomas: It may be of interest to you gentlemen to know the sectional complexion of the men representing this Commission in the Army and Navy. There are ten from the North and sixteen from the South.

Rolla V. Watt: As I said before, with the exception of Brother Randall I came a longer distance to this meeting than any other man on this Commission. I came with the hope that I might be able to remain until we had completed our task and were ready to report to our respective General Conferences that unification is practicable. I still have that hope, but I am satisfied that if we prolong these separate discussions we shall not be through in time for your General Conference. I hope we shall take the two or three points concerning which there is a difference of opinion and crystallize our thoughts on them and come back here this afternoon with the hope that we may come to an agreement on them. There is no use staying here until the middle of next week if there is no real hope of agreeing. I am willing to stay if there is a reasonable hope of agreeing, although I ought to be on my way to California right now.

Bishop McDowell: Let us see how we are fixed at the end of the afternoon.

T. D. Samford: I would like to add to what I have already said: No question of personal convenience would cause me to ask for leave of absence. A matter of great importance to the government is set for the early part of next week. It is a matter over which I have no control whatever, and it is imperative that I shall leave this evening. At a later date I may be

able to return, and I could return here in twelve hours' time. If this Commission in in session the latter part of next week, I shall be glad to return and remain until our labors are concluded. I want the members of the Commission to know that it is not an ordinary matter of business that takes me away.

The session closed with the singing of "Rock of Ages," and the benediction by Bishop Collins Denny.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Joint Commission was called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Collins Denny.

The hymn, "How firm a foundation, ye saints of the Lord," was sung.

Bishop Denny read a passage from the first chapter of Ephesians and offered prayer.

The hymn, "He leadeth me! O blessed thought!" was sung.

The roll was called and the following were present: Bishops Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, W. B. Murrah, James Atkins, Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Ministers: F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar, Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. J. Wallace, C. M. Stuart. Laymen: M. L. Walton, H. N. Snyder, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, T. D. Samford, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, H. H. White, G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock.

Edgar Blake: I want to announce that Dr. Ainsworth was unavoidably detained by a wedding and he has delegated his vote to me until he returns!

Bishop Earl Cranston took the chair as presiding officer.

Secretary Harris: I have to report to the Commission the following action taken by the Commission on Unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church:

Resolved, That this Commission advise the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, that if the Southern Commissioners, without committing themselves to all its provisions, will accept, in principle, the report of the Committee of Eight, this Commission will likewise accept it; and that this Commission recommends that when the report shall have been so accepted by both Commissions, any members of the Joint Commission shall be at liberty to propose, by motion, in session of the Joint Commission, any change he may desire.

Bishop Denny: That goes to record, I suppose?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Yes.

Bishop Denny: There was placed in my hands, as temporary Chairman, the following statement from the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South:

The Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has taken the following action. It took action by amending the report of the Joint Committee of Eight as follows:

Add to the recommendations on the 4th page the following: *Provided*, that if the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church decides to become a part of the proposed organization, the colored members of the reorganized Church shall have and are hereby granted the privileges of organization into an Associate General Conference in accordance with the plan herein provided. In the event that the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church should not accept the invitation to join in the organization of an Associate Regional or Associate General Conference, as proposed above, the Regional Conference within the territory predominantly Southern Methodist territory shall be allowed to direct their contributions for the colored work to the benefit of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church.

It took action by adopting the following motion:

Resolved, That we approve the report as a basis for determining the status of the negro within the reorganized Church.

It adopted the following resolution:

Inasmuch as the plan now being worked out involves certain changes in the plan of reorganization as projected by the Joint Commission and approved by our General Conference; therefore be it

Resolved by this Commission, That we do not feel fully authorized to approve them in the sense of being empowered to act upon them at this juncture; but, acting under our general instructions to work out a plan for reorganization, we do approve them as being a part of the only plan which at this time seems possible, and we are agreed that they shall be transmitted to our General Conference with the recommendation that the plan, in so far as worked out and agreed upon by the Joint Commission, be the basis of reorganization.

Inasmuch as we now have the collective reports that have come from each of the two Commissions, and have, therefore, something exact upon which to take a vote, I desire to move, after any questions are asked that may be desired or any business transacted that is necessary, that the two Commissions be permitted to again dis sever themselves for the purpose of considering the action which they can properly take in view of these two reports.

The motion was seconded.

R. E. Blackwell: It seems to me we ought to have some discussion before we do that.

Bishop Leete: Perfectly willing for that.

Edgar Blake: Each Commission ought to know somewhat the mind of the other, especially as we have adopted a number of resolutions and amendments and I think we ought to know why we adopted them.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Would it not be just as well for the Secretaries to make some explanation or some running statement for the information of the joint body?

A. F. Watkins: I suggest that Dr. Thomas present to the Joint Commission the reasons that led him to offer to the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the first resolution suggested in the report of our Chairman, Bishop Denny. It was the first resolution.

Bishop Denny: We have but two.

A. F. Watkins: It was not a recommendation as to the second part of the report at all. It was the first resolution, and I think it is due the members of the Joint Commission that they may understand the scope of that resolution and consequently the consideration that led to its being offered to our Commission and adopted.

Bishop McDowell: I venture to differ slightly from both of these propositions, but will make a suggestion that is a sort of compromise between the motion for separate meetings of the two Commissions and the exact opposite of that—namely, the continuation in joint session. I believe at this time we would get along pretty well if we would simply have a little informal talk without the formality of voting and decisions, but conducted on the basis of what each of the two Commissions in separate sessions considered and more or less formally agreed to. I do not want to make a motion that we go into informal session or into Committee of the Whole, but would be glad if we could consider ourselves in a somewhat informal meeting for the next hour or as much longer as we care to be in session.

John M. Moore: I am in accord with the suggestion made by Bishop McDowell, but I think it might be well if we would make preparations for bringing together the ideas in those two statements. If I interpret them aright, they are reaching toward common ground. It seems to me that we ought to have a Committee on Conference such as they have in Congress between the Senate and the House of Representatives. It seems to me if we could talk here together for an hour informally and then refer this matter to the Committee on Conference—I don't know what else to call it—and let them see where the two fit in and see if out of them could not be brought a statement that we could present to the Joint Commission for adoption—it seems to me in that way we could get down to the real work that we want to do. I simply make that suggestion. I will not make it as a motion.

John F. Goucher: Just reading these, and not having them under my eye, I do not finally get a clear conception of them. I would like to ask the significance of that resolution about post-

poning the presentation to the General Conference. Does that mean that we are not disposed to agree upon a plan to be presented to the two General Conferences?

A. F. Watkins: Not at all.

John F. Goucher: Have that read again, please.

A. F. Watkins: Dr. Thomas offered that resolution. Let him explain it.

Frank M. Thomas: I shall be glad to explain it if the Commission wants me to.

John F. Goucher: I am very anxious to hear it and I think the rest are also. I could not catch it in the one reading.

Frank M. Thomas: You want the statement of the attitude of our Commission—

John F. Goucher: —with reference to the General Conference.

Frank M. Thomas: Do you refer to the amendment or to the statement?

A. F. Watkins: Your own motion.

Frank M. Thomas: I am trying to get what Dr. Goucher wants. I know what you gentlemen want.

A. F. Watkins: He wants that part about postponing explained.

Frank M. Thomas: I had some difficulty in making myself clear to the men who know my own thinking. Perhaps I am in a higher intellectual atmosphere!

Bishop Mouzon: Read the whole paper.

Frank M. Thomas (Reading):

Inasmuch as the plan now being worked out involves certain changes in the plan of reorganization as projected by the Joint Commission and approved by our General Conference.

Bishop Cranston and I are the only two men present who were present at the first meeting of the Committee of Nine which framed the series of suggestions upon which all later actions have been taken. I need not go into details with reference to that meeting, but I will say, if you will study the document presented at that time you will see that the two Churches were confronted by two concepts of reorganization which were profoundly at variance. One was the idea of the Consolidated Regional Conference, and the other was the idea of the Council with autonomous quadrennial jurisdiction. In our approach to each other that line of division has grown perceptibly less until we have finally molded those two bodies into one, and that one body has both the features of a General Conference and in some aspects also the features and powers of a Regional Conference. The Regional Conference has not been obliterated—it still has its powers and privileges and authorities—but we have bridged

the gulf that seemed at one time to be insuperable between us. The point is this, that the Commission at Chattanooga did not quite contemplate the synthesis that we have achieved. Nor did our General Conference quite conceive the synthesis of the quadrennial jurisdiction. It is a serious question in my mind whether, if this synthesis that we have now arrived at had been presented to our General Conference at its last session as we have it now adopted—whether in their state of thinking at that time it would have been possible to adopt it. The position we have taken is simply this: that as Commissioners we were instructed to find a plan of reorganization. We were morally bound to seek a plan to the very last gap, intellectually and spiritually, under the demands of our two Churches, and I think we have been doing that. But when we come here to agree we can agree upon those things we are empowered to agree upon—that is, we can accept what we were empowered to accept. In a larger movement we are empowered to formulate, but we must carry back to our General Conference that which has been formulated for its adoption. We have formulated a synthetic General Conference which was not contemplated by our General Conference. What we propose to do is to approve it as the best possible solution of the situation, and carry it back to our General Conference that it be made the basis of reorganization. Is that clear?

John F. Goucher: Does not everything have to go back to the General Conference in some way?

Frank M. Thomas: That is true.

John F. Goucher: Then, this does not differ in that particular from any other provision.

Frank M. Thomas: No.

Bishop McDowell: Let me ask Dr. Thomas a question. May I?

Frank M. Thomas: Certainly.

Bishop McDowell: I understand you to make a distinction between sending back to the General Conference a plan for its adoption and sending back a plan with our recommendations as a working basis for the General Conference? I am only anxious to get matters perfectly straight in my own mind; and that I do not understand it is undoubtedly due to the fact that I am on the same or a lower intellectual level than your associates who had similar trouble.

Frank M. Thomas: I am glad to find my associates on such a high level.

Bishop McDowell: I am glad to be on anything like the same level with them.

Frank M. Thomas: I think I can answer Bishop McDowell's

question. Bishop Cranston and I, and perhaps Bishop Denny, are the only men who have tracked the line of movement so carefully. There were certain basic things agreed upon.

Bishop Cranston: We had no thought at that time of the world organization in the comprehensive sense in which we have it now. What he means by "synthetic" is the bringing together of the foreign jurisdictions into the American organization. What we agreed upon was the Quadrennial Conference arrangement of the United States, and your Commission feels that they are authorized to go ahead on the basis of the principles as to the home organization, but as to the other point since introduced you think it should go to the General Conference.

Frank M. Thomas: No, you haven't got our idea at all.

Bishop McDowell: Will you read the entire statement and then make your comment in the light of the reading?

Frank M. Thomas (Reading):

Inasmuch as the plan now being worked out involved certain changes in the plan of reorganization as projected by the Joint Commission and approved by our General Conference; therefore be it

Resolved by this Commission, That we do not feel fully authorized to approve them in the sense of being empowered to act upon them at this juncture—

Edgar Blake: Permit me to interrupt. How do "approve" and "act upon" differ?

Frank M. Thomas: There is a vast difference between a man being authorized to consummate negotiations upon a direct point or being directed to refer back with the recommendation that it be adopted upon a specific point.

Bishop Mouzon: I would be glad if Dr. Thomas would read the entire resolution.

Frank M. Thomas (Reading):

Be it resolved by this Commission, That we do not feel fully authorized to approve them in the sense of being empowered to act upon them at this juncture; but, acting under our general instructions to work out a plan of reorganization, we do approve them as being a part of the only plan which at this time seems possible, and we are agreed that they shall be transmitted to our General Conference with the recommendation that the plan, in so far as worked out and agreed upon by the Joint Commission, be the basis of reorganization.

Let me explain that in the process of these negotiations we have from the Southern standpoint at least shifted the base slightly. We have shifted the base from a General Conference absolutely distinct and separate from a quadrennial jurisdiction which was autonomous within its sphere, to a General Conference which is synthetic, a movement which was not contemplated by the Joint Commission, at least the Southern branch of it or by the

General Conference when it gave its instructions at Oklahoma City. In the process of our negotiations we have come to the idea of a synthetic General Conference. Now, we are prepared as a Commission to approve that with all the other plans combined with that and report that to our General Conference with the recommendation that it be made the basis of reorganization.

David G. Downey: That is to say, you do not wish to report a plan on which the restricted General Conference shall act, but rather certain principles to be the basis of a new plan.

Frank M. Thomas: No, sir; you do not catch what I read: "In so far as worked out and agreed upon by the Joint Commission."

David G. Downey: Well, what about that?

Frank M. Thomas: Whatever we agree upon together as a Joint Commission we shall report under this new concept of a synthetic General Conference as the basis of reorganization. If we report one one-hundredth part, we report that as a basis. If we report one-half of it, we report that. If we report it all, we report it all.

Abram W. Harris: May I ask two questions?

Frank M. Thomas: Certainly.

Abram W. Harris: I read the following words of the resolution:

Be it resolved by this Commission, That we do not feel fully authorized to approve them in the sense of being empowered to act upon them at this juncture.

Now, suppose I drop out the first of those two parallel statements, "feel authorized to approve," and read it without that:

Be it resolved by this Commission, That we do not feel fully authorized to act upon them at this juncture.

I don't understand what it is you do not feel authorized to do. Now, in the last line I read as follows:

With the recommendation that the plan, in so far as worked out and agreed upon by the Joint Commission—

It ought to be worked out, should it not?

Frank M. Thomas: Yes.

Abram W. Harris (Reading): "To be the basis of reorganization." What do you mean by "basis"?

Frank M. Thomas: That is the whole plan itself, that whatever we agree upon here shall be the basis. If we agree upon the whole plan, it becomes the whole foundation, house, and everything; but if we succeed in working out only a part, that would be the basis.

Abram W Harris: Would that mean whatever we agree upon and you recommend—you recommend the General Conference to accept it?

Frank M. Thomas: Yes, and to make it the basis.

David G. Downey: You spoil it by that; that makes it different.

Frank M. Thomas: By its acceptance it becomes a basis.

Abram W. Harris: Do you recommend that you adopt it?

Frank M. Thomas: Yes.

Abram W Harris: That is all of it then?

Frank M. Thomas: Yes.

Abram W Harris: Now, Dr. Thomas did not answer my first question.

Frank M. Thomas: I am not surprised that this is not instantly understood. It took me until midnight to convince some of our men. Very few people have legal training and know the history of this movement.

Bishop Leete: I have had a little legal training and I have read a little of the history of the movement, but I am not quite clear just what is in your mind. You speak about "what has been worked out." What has been worked out? That is what I want to know. As a matter of fact, up to this moment we have absolutely adopted nothing except tentatively. Now, what has been worked out?

Frank M. Thomas: I think this, brethren, and I am very fair to say that the Commission of the Church, South, is ready to vote on this plan here that has been presented by the Committee of Eight. We are ready to vote upon the Judicial Council and we are ready to vote upon "Other Conferences."

Bishop Leete: Then I get your meaning. You mean to say what we hereafter make a part of our action?

Frank M. Thomas: Yes.

Bishop Leete: But as yet we haven't made any action?

Bishop Atkins: I want to make a remark that may throw a little light on the situation. The Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, know they have gone beyond the authority given by the General Conference. They did that in the way of making progress. The matter has come into an entirely different aspect from what it was when we started to work upon it. I confess my ignorance, but you must recollect that this is my first time with you. You kept your secrets to yourselves. I did not know where you were and the Churches did not know where you were. Publication has not been made. Bishop McDowell asked just now what was meant by "basis." I will tell you, we will recommend this back as the best this Joint Commission has been able to agree upon and let it go to the

General Conference in order that they may pass on that. I don't even go so far as to pledge my vote—unfortunately I have no vote or voice in the General Conference, but I do not commit myself to the approval of it when I come to it at the General Conference, but as the basis of having done something in these four years to submit that to the General Conference for its action. That is what we mean by "basis," or at least that is what I meant by "basis" when I voted for it.

Bishop McDowell: May I refer to the proceedings of the Commission at Baltimore for the purpose of helping clear our minds about this matter and in order that I may ask Dr. Thomas or any one else who may wish to answer concerning this statement? I only desire to know perfectly what is meant by every statement there. It will be remembered that in behalf of the Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church the following statement was made:

The Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church is authorized and directed to negotiate with the Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South:

1. On the basis of the document adopted by the Joint Commission on Federation at Chattanooga, and presented to both General Conferences.
2. On the basis of the action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, taken at Oklahoma.
3. On the basis of action taken by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Saratoga. It is considered that these three documents, at least, are all before us with a degree of official standing that does not attach to any other documents now formally before us.

But the Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church also regards itself as authorized and empowered to consider these various actions as recommended but not as stating final instructions from which we are not authorized to make any departure. We are further authorized, as you will see from the document that has just been read, after reaching an agreement with the Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, to enter negotiations, and this presumably with your consent, with other Methodisms, particularly with the Methodist Protestant Church, which was a party to the first document.

We were further authorized to negotiate with other Methodisms. Now, what are we to understand? And if the Commission from the Church, South, regard that as the binding force of their instructions, it will be in exact harmony with the principle for which we all stood from the start—that each Commission shall interpret its own instructions. Does the Commission of the Church, South, wish it understood that in what might be called the final action by the Joint Commission they were only authorized to act upon the lines laid down in the proceedings taken at their General Conference, but if in the going forward with the work of this Joint Commission additional and unexpected issues and considerations should arise—is it your judgment that those additional matters that seem in real principle to vary from what

was before your General Conference, that the raising of these additional conditions require you and require us to agree as far as we can agree here, but to report these extra matters back as not being in quite the same relation to the work of this body as those matters covered by the formal deliverance of the General Conference? Is that the understanding?

Frank M. Thomas: That covers the ground very essentially.

Bishop McDowell: In other words, to make it perfectly plain, there was a theory of the General Conference that did not at the moment take into purview a General Conference that should be made up of representatives from a Central Conference in Southern Asia or a Central Conference in Eastern Asia or a Central Conference in Europe or a Central Conference organized on racial lines here or a Central Conference in Latin America, that this new matter is such new matter that you do not feel that the document upon which we are now acting warrants you to take the same kind of vote upon the new matters that you would take upon the other matters that are included in that document.

Frank M. Thomas: I would not draw that distinction.

A. F. Watkins: May I undertake to express in a sentence my understanding of the resolution?

Frank M. Thomas: Allow me a word of explanation. This resolution was first passed as a kind of clarification of some problems that had arisen in the minds of our Commissioners in reference to their instructions. It was later decided that in strict fairness we would transmit this action to this body so that they might know exactly the state of affairs. We stand in the attitude of being not only commanded by the express will of our General Conference, but morally bound as well to seek to find a solution of all our problems and report back that solution to our General Conference, but in the solving of these many large new problems that have arisen we have passed beyond the purview of the first Joint Commission, and also the outlook perhaps along the same line of our own General Conference with reference to specific instructions. But we have not violated those instructions.

A. F. Watkins: In the first place, the paper seems to me to be very complicated in its language and seems to me now, as it did at the time it was presented to us, to be unnecessary of passage; but that is neither here nor there. That paper was presented for the benefit of, and directed to, the Commissioners representing the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, as outlining in some measure the report Dr. Thomas should make to the General Conference. When the question was asked whether or not this was something we did not expect to show to the brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the statement was made at once,

"Oh, no, we are perfectly willing that they should see it," and for that reason, although it was not really a resolution bearing upon the merits of this report, still our Chairman was instructed to acquaint the General Commission with its import. I understand Dr. Thomas to say that his conviction is that in the developments of these negotiations we have gone beyond the thought that was in the minds of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, but that he thinks the advance steps are entirely justifiable under the liberal instructions with which we came from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and he proposes that in our report to the General Conference we should say that while we believe in the development of this subject we have gone beyond your instructions at certain points, still we believe our progress beyond that was entirely justifiable, and we herewith report this action as a basis for unification.

Frank M. Thomas: I can clarify this matter by saying that they are not going to put me in the attitude of being the sole person responsible for this document. I did write it and every man in the Commission voted for it except one and the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, stands behind this document.

T. N. Ivey: In honesty, I may correct the Secretary in one respect. I did not vote for that paper. I would have said nothing about it except that Secretary Thomas says that only one did not vote for it. I did not vote for it for the reason that I believe that I, as a Commissioner, am empowered to vote finally here so far as the Commission is concerned.

Frank M. Thomas: I rise to a point of order. That document is before us as coming from the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and this other is not in order.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): It is hard to say what is in order.

Bishop McDowell: If Dr. Thomas will allow me, we are in a somewhat informal relation right now. This is a moment when we are asking God in our hearts to hold us steadier than we have ever been held before, and we are, therefore, proceeding informally. No intensity of feeling is upon us. We are not going to hurry ourselves into a vote and we can proceed in quietness of spirit. I feel that we have not been making quite so much progress at any time as we are possibly making this afternoon.

Frank M. Thomas: May I tell you a story?

Bishop Mouzon: We don't want to hear stories.

Frank M. Thomas: I have the floor and I think I have the right to make an explanation.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Go ahead.

Frank M. Thomas: There was a young lawyer in Kentucky who had argued a case all the way up from the Magistrate's Court to the Court of Appeals, and he was going into the details when the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals finally said, "Don't go into such details; this court of last resort is supposed to know some law." The young lawyer said, "Your Honor, I beg pardon, but I made that mistake in the lower courts and that is the reason I am here." That is the reason I am here. I will say to Bishop McDowell, the difficulty lies in the fact that there are perhaps two different points of view with reference to our Commission and your Commission. Your Commission has been given large powers and is attempting the negotiation in a generous and brotherly spirit. Our Church has a way not of hedging us about, but by directing us by specific instructions. It has always been a stickler for the bond and letter of the law, and we feel bound by it and we have got to interpret the action of our General Conference in the light of our outlook in relation to that Conference.

Bishop McDowell: That has been agreed to.

Frank M. Thomas: I do not want the impression to get abroad that we were not empowered. We were empowered—fully authorized in every way to formulate a plan of union and vote upon that plan and return that plan to our General Conference for its action.

Bishop Cooke: Will Dr. Thomas state just precisely what are the things you are not empowered to do?

John F. Goucher: That seems perfectly plain since I have had an opportunity of reading it. But I want to be informed whether I am correct in my interpretation of it. I understand that there are two things included in the statement. One of them is a statement of interpretation. The Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has specific instructions and limitations from the General Conference, and therefore they put themselves on record as interpreting that matter. That is a matter with which we have nothing to do at all. The second matter here is their action concerning the matter in hand with which we have something to do. They have put the whole matter before us that we may not be in ignorance of their interpretation of their relation to the acts of their General Conference, but the only matter in which we are interested is this:

Be it resolved by this Commission, That we are agreed that the plan now being worked out shall be transmitted to our General Conference with recommendations that the plan in so far as worked out and agreed upon by the Joint Commission be the basis of reorganization.

That is, as I understand it, and I wish to know if I am correct—that is the action which comes to us as the official action

and in which we as a Joint Commission are interested and the rest is simply interpretation.

Bishop Mouzon: Maybe I can make the matter a little plainer; for when one has been taught himself, he is in position to teach others. This is perfectly plain to you when once you understand it.

Bishop McDowell: Absolutely correct.

Bishop Mouzon: When this was first proposed, I objected very strenuously to it, and I said I would never agree to it; but by and by a half a dozen hands were working on this and a word was added here and yonder until finally I agreed to vote for it, and not only so, but I came to the conclusion that it was a very important statement for us to make. I think at first it was not contemplated that this should come before you as a Joint Commission. It was intended to be an interpretation of the limits of our own authority, and it was intended that it should be sent to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, when that Conference meets. Now, what do we mean by it? We mean just this: It is altogether likely that in some particulars we have gone beyond our instructions—that is to say, there are members on the Southern Commission who have had in mind what was said and done before the meeting of this Commission at the meeting in Chattanooga and in the Committee on Church Relations at the General Conference which met in Oklahoma City in 1914. To be perfectly plain, there was before our people to begin with the thought of a Quadrennial Conference, much more autonomous than the Regional Conference which has been developed here. It had never occurred to us that the Regional Conference would hold its first session just after the assembling of the General Conference. The Regional Conference certainly has had some of its power taken from it and given to the General Conference, so that the General Conference has larger powers than was originally contemplated, and the Regional Conference does not have as large power as was originally contemplated. That is the heart of the matter, and a number of the brethren on our Commission felt that we should say to our General Conference that possibly we had gone somewhat beyond the limits of our authority, but that nevertheless this was the best that could be done, and we believe this to be a good plan and we recommend that the General Conference adopt it as a basis for further negotiations.

Bishop McDowell: That would involve a continuation of our work.

Bishop Mouzon: In the minds of many of us it did. We felt that we could not complete this matter in all its details at this session, and we thought we would rather gather up all our work

the best that we can do with the report on the Judicial Council, with the report on the Regional Conferences, and with the report on the Status of the Colored Membership in the Reorganized Church—that we would go just as far as we could with it and then take it up to the General Conference and say: “This is the best we have been able to do up to the present time and we recommend that you take this and let it serve as a basis for further negotiations.”

Bishop McDowell: Then you would not, under those circumstances, expect to present to the General Conference a document upon which you would ask that Conference to take a constitutional vote and hand down to your Annual Conferences and to have a like vote taken by our General Conference and handed down to our Annual Conferences; but you would probably send it up as the best we were able to do and you would recommend a continuation of the Joint Commission or the creation of a new Joint Commission with possibly larger instructions for further work upon this plan.

Bishop Mouzon: I think I would agree to everything that you have said and add this, that at the same time we would recommend the plan that is here agreed to as the basis for the complete plan, recommend the work that we shall be able to do as furnishing a basis for further negotiations, and that the plan of unification shall be worked out in harmony.

Bishop McDowell: You would ask the General Conference to make a distinction between approving this and giving it constitutional sanction?

Frank M. Thomas: I think we should be careful here. The term “further negotiations” is not here; “That the plan in so far as worked out and agreed upon by the Joint Commission be recommended to our General Conference as a basis of reorganization.” There is quite a distinction there. If we could work out that plan here, we will report the whole plan.

T. N. Ivey: And as I understand it, we are to work out a complete system or plan and send that up to the General Conference. I don't take it that there shall not be a completion of the plan, if possible, by the next General Conference.

Frank M. Thomas: Not at all. That was not contemplated.

John M. Moore: I have not been well for a couple of days, and I did not get to the meeting this morning, so I was not present when action was taken on this resolution, but as reported I surely understood that it meant we should work this matter out and submit it to the General Conference for such action as it chose to take.

T. N. Ivey: That was my idea.

John M. Moore: It was not to be a matter of further negotia-

tions or appointing another Committee on Unification. No such thought as that was in my mind; unless it happens that the General Conference declines to accept what we send and say, "This is not satisfactory to us; we cannot accept the elements of the plan you bring to us, but we will recommit this to another Commission to see what they can do." But it was evident to my mind that we were to work out this plan and send it to the General Conference and say to the General Conference that while we may have transcended that which was in the minds of those who constituted the Commission we have had these negotiations and we have formulated this that we report to you, and we ask you to take such action as you think best.

Bishop Denny: Unfortunately I was quite indisposed and not able to remain with our Commissioners last night until they concluded their meeting. Nor was I able to meet with them this morning, and so I did not hear all the discussion on this resolution which is now before you for question and explanation. If, without involving any one else, you will permit me to state for myself what I have in mind in connection with this resolution, I shall be very grateful to you. Making constitutions or drafting statutes is by no means an easy piece of work. We are at that work here. I do not disparage the intellect of any of the men with whom I have been working when I say that perhaps none of us has fully compassed all that is involved in the negotiations in which we have been engaged. Let us go back for the point of departure to the Chattanooga meeting. Now, there we had before us a recommendation from a Committee of Nine. That recommendation included a Council, which was preferentially later on called a General Conference. Personally, I did not think it wise to use the term "General Conference," because every term in common use carries with it an atmosphere from which you never can deliver it, and I had too long studied the influence and effect of that not to know that no greater fallacy ever arose than the fallacy that you can use words without the atmosphere and association that they import. Without going into details, we concluded that we should have a General Conference which should have oversight of our articles of religion and the ritual of the Church and the terms of membership—

Frank M. Thomas: And it was to consist of two houses.

Bishop Denny: Yes, the General Conference was to consist of two houses. These connectional interests, missionary and educational, into which our people go much more as a matter of loyalty than they do as a matter of full comprehension—these questions do not touch the daily life of our people. They hear of them through our pulpits and they support them because they are connected with the Church. Some few of them are well

informed about them, but the mass of our people are not at all informed about these matters of large connectional interests. You may not have such people, but I have been asked by members of our own Church, official members, how often our General Conference meets. The plan which we had in mind at Chattanooga and which was recommended by the meeting held in Chattanooga included four Quadrennial Conferences, three white and one colored. It is not necessary to go into the division of the members. That was a plan agreed upon. There are several of us who remember that Dr. Hyer, Dr. Thomas, Bishop Cranston, Brother Bishop, and Dr. Young are among those who were present. Dr. Goucher was not present on account of being absent from the country. Several of your strong and lovable men whom I can never forget and whom I feel very grateful that I had the privilege of associating with—those men understand just what is in my mind and what I am trying to make clear to you. These Quadrennial Conferences were in our thought, and the recommendation was that they were to be autonomous and independent within the local sphere. A question was asked me by one of your associates, "What would be left to the Quadrennial Conferences if these general matters were taken care of by the General Conference?" and my answer was that if there was nothing of importance left to them there would be no great concession made in leaving it to them. Some of us thought there would be a great deal left to them, because the powers of this Quadrennial Conference are the powers which most closely touch the people of our Churches. They apply to the home life of the Churches, and the people are interested and largely informed about them. Our General Conference adopted as a basis those Chattanooga recommendations. In the course of our negotiations there has been a great landslide. The whole side of the mountain is gone. We possibly have the power to negotiate and carry back for approval anything whatever, but that we have gone far away from the understanding of our General Conference and the intention of our General Conference, seems to me to be beyond any question. So far as action is concerned, nothing more can be done than to report to the Conference that it was not possible for us to get more of what is desired than has been obtained, and your Commissioners bring back what they have obtained from the Joint Commission for your oversight and recommendation, and acceptance or rejection, just as meets the judgment of the General Conference. There with us the initial power rests, and it then goes to the Annual Conference after it has passed the General Conference by the requisite majority. That ought to be given in connection with the statement. As a matter of frankness and as a matter of justice

to you brethren, it was thought you ought to know about this. It would not have been right for us to hold this back and carry it to our General Conference without a word to you. We owed it to you with whom we have been negotiating to let you know that there has been this landslide from the position our General Conference has taken, and why we are now not on the mountain top, but away down where the land has slipped. I am not quite sure that I have been clear in what I have said, but as I caught the discussion and so far as I could agree with it, that was what was in my own mind and the understanding I had of this paper.

H. M. Du Bose: Whatever may be the significance or importance of this resolution brought into our session by Dr. Thomas and adopted in this form, and while there was diversity of opinion as to the propriety of bringing it in, finally there was practical unanimity in the frank expression, "Let us bring it before our brethren of this Commission." Whatever significance there may be in it, the fact is not to be lost sight of that the report of this Commission has a bearing upon the matter at issue—that is, the report of the Committee of Eight as expressed in the action taken upon the resolution introduced by Dr. Snyder, which is of record: Resolved, that we approve the report—that is, the report of the Committee of Eight—as a basis for determining the Status of the Negro in the Reorganized Church. That was our concrete action.

E. B. Chappell: And the only action on this matter.

H. M. Du Bose: I can express my own mind on this. I could wish at least that that part of Dr. Thomas's report which has been asked about so constantly might in some way be withdrawn, or retired as part of the general statement, because it was only brought here out of our feeling of frankness that we should not enter into any form of statement to our General Conference that we did not make known to you; but I rose for the purpose of impressing upon the minds of the brethren of the other Commission that our action was contained in that resolution (and that is the only one on the report of the Committee of Eight; and in this terse language we adopted it) as a basis for determining the status of the negro within the reorganized Church.

Edgar Blake: It seems to me there is only one matter that needs to be cleared up and I think that can be done very readily. What I would like to know is this, and I fancy our Commission would like to know it: Is the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, willing to complete and perfect a plan for the Constitutional reorganization of the two Churches here represented? And if a plan be agreed upon by the Joint Commission, is the Commission of the Church, South, willing to re-

port the same to its General Conference and recommend its approval and adoption?

Bishop Mouzon: May I answer Dr. Blake's question?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Certainly.

Bishop Mouzon: Both questions are answered, according to my understanding, emphatically yes. If it is at all possible for us to perfect a plan and to complete it in its details so that we may go before our General Conference, and then when given constitutional sanction that it be sent to the Annual Conferences for their adoption and their approval or rejection, the Commissioners of the Southern Church would be delighted to see that done, and we will work with you as long as you will work with us toward the completion of that plan. If that plan is perfected, the Commissioners of the Church, South, will send it to the General Conference with their approval and with the recommendation that it be passed down to the Annual Conferences.

Alex. Simpson, Jr: I understand there is before us for consideration not merely this report from the Commissioners of the Church, South, but the report from the Commissioners of the Church, North. I use those expressions, because my mind recalls them as the Church, North, and the Church, South, and not as the Methodist Episcopal Church or the Methodist Episcopal Church, South—and on these reports there are a few things that ought to be said here. I appreciate very fully the reasons which actuated the Commissioners from the Church, South, in laying this matter before us just as they did, so that we might, as far as possible, enter into their minds in our further negotiations in regard to this matter; but for exactly the same reason we ought to lay before them what was in our minds, and the result of our deliberations, aside from the mere formal resolution which has been produced here, for the reasons so well expressed by Bishop Denny when he was speaking. There are certain verbal objections which were made by the Commissioners of the Church, North, in regard to the plan that is before us and certain changes which were suggested. I am not going into the details of those suggested changes except in one or two instances, because I think they can best come from those who in the separate meetings of the Commission of the Church, North, made the suggestions. But there are two or three things which, when called to your attention, will show the necessity for further consideration of the matter, and the putting of it into a somewhat different shape from that under which it appears in the report of the Committee of Eight, for instance, and this is one of the things which will show at once how carefully a committee such as the Committee of Eight should look at the matter. They have overlooked an absolutely fundamental thing.

It is provided in the last part of Article VIII. that when an Associate General Conference is formed the Associate General Conference shall have the powers of a General Conference minus two certain specified things. Don't you see what you have done in that event? You have taken away from the Regional Conference any right to select bishops, and you have made a General Conference which can only confirm, so that while you have a body that can confirm a bishop you have nobody that can create one.

Edgar Blake: We didn't have any bishop on the committee.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: You will see from that statement how necessary it is for further negotiations to get these things in shape. Following what I said about Bishop Denny's remarks on the subject of feeling—I say feeling, but it is a good deal more than feeling which the use of certain words carry to every one of our minds—there was a strong feeling in our Commission that two or three things ought to be done. A good many of our members objected to the word "Associate" and Dr. Downey pointed out to us that the powers—the organization and almost everything which we have here given to the Regional Conferences—are in fact given also to what we call the Associate Regional Conferences, and there would seem to be no difficulty right there in having the six Regional Conferences composed of the various States in the Union, and the other five racial or lingual or missionary, without calling them such; and when you come to state the powers of the different classes, state them differently, but get rid of that additional name, whether sub or associate, and therefore get rid of the idea generally carried with it. As Bishop Denny has suggested, every word has some idea that it generally carries into the public mind. Thus, as to the General Conference, the word "General" carries more than was intended, and several of the Commissioners want to get rid of "Associate General." Call it a "Central," which would take away from it those general powers which of necessity can rest nowhere else than in a General Conference, the supreme legislative body of the Church. What I desire is this: I want, before these motions are put, that those Commissioners of the Church, North, who made the suggestions which appeal to us, should show those various suggested changes which they believe would simplify the matter and remove any probable misunderstanding; that they should state them in this Joint Commission just as they were stated in the separate Commissions, so that the members of the Church, South, will know what was in our hearts before there is appointed a Committee on Conference, as suggested by Dr. Moore, or further consideration in separate Commissions, as suggested by some one else. Personally,

I prefer Dr. Moore's suggestion. Now, another thing following along the lines of what Bishop Mouzon said: I think this Joint Commission has reached a point where we are at least so close together that if it is anyway possible, we should, before the meeting of the General Conference of the Church, South, put a plan in absolute form in which it can be presented to the General Conference of the Church, South, and if it meets the approval of that body be sent down to the Annual Conferences for consideration. If that shall be done, the effect of that action by the General Conference of the Church, South, would be that the Annual Conferences of the Church, North, having it within their power to initiate the same proceedings, can proceed before the meeting of the General Conference of the Church, North, to vote likewise upon that plan, and to bring the result of their considerations to the General Conference of the Church, North, at the time of its meeting two years hence. By this method, if we should have the approval of our Annual Conferences, followed by the approval of the General Conference of the Church, North, we shall be in a position to have a united Church at least four years earlier than it is possible to have it by any other plan. That, I think, is the most important thing. We are so close together that I want to have that little film of air that seems to separate us removed, so that we may be one at the earliest possible moment in this great Church of ours, the united Church that I love and you love—for I love your Church, South, as I love the Church, North—that this Church of ours may at the very earliest possible moment be ready to move forward in the world work which it is necessary to have it do, and which is going to be very much enlarged and to need our united action every moment, at least when the war in Europe is at an end. If we are ready at that time to do all we ought to do when our boys come back from those foreign shores, they will come back to the old Church that is ready to take up the work that they want taken up and will be ready to move forward to the greatest fulfillment that the Methodist or any other Church has ever known. Let us, brethren, as completely as we can, reach that consummation which is most devoutly to be wished.

John F. Goucher: All of which I most steadfastly believe, plus. The General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church assembled in Saratoga anticipated, in its enthusiasm with that spirit which authorized and instructed the Commissioners to deal generously by the Southern Commissioners, that when this Joint Commission would come together that God would give them a vision to interpret his will and the will of both Churches. Therefore it took action and instructed its officials concerning a plan to be presented to the General Conference of the Method-

ist Episcopal Church in 1918, instructing its Board of Bishops to call the General Conference, which adjourned subject to that call. The same delegates are to be members of the adjourned General Conference, the committee which arranged for the meeting in Saratoga is instructed to arrange for the place and time of the adjourned meeting, and all instructions are given to the bishops to make that call, so that if we agree on a plan to be presented to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the Board of Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church are instructed to call an adjourned session of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, that the two General Conferences might be in session at the same time and place and could have their Conferences backward and forward; as either Conference found a difficulty the matter might be eliminated and the two Churches could send down to their Annual Conferences a plan which might be agreed upon, so that the whole thing could be consummated twelve months thereafter so far as the legal steps could be taken. That being the case, you could take action at your General Conference and we can take action at our General Conference; and, please God, they will be the last two separate General Conferences. If they give instruction in case the plan is approved by the Annual Conferences for the election of delegates to a Joint General Conference to meet in 1920, that would be the General Conference to complete the details for the reorganized Church. If I can interpret the wish of God, which I cannot except as I catch some marvelous thought from Him, united Methodism could be ready for its high commission when the war is over. It is a significant fact that at this time the Presbyterians are in negotiation with each other for union, and members have said that if the Methodists succeed in getting together it would assure their getting together. I have been told the same thing concerning the Lutheran Church. It seems to me that in the providence of God we are called to go forward, keep step with His purpose and lead the way, while the Christ influence works for unification in the Presbyterian and Lutheran Churches. These three organized, unified, great Christian Churches would give tremendous emphasis to America's influence in helping to develop an internationalism which will make for righteousness, hold the world in peace, and give us a direct influence, if not a controlling influence, in the reshaping of the nations after this world war is over. Therefore, I believe that we should proceed with our faces to larger things than ever before.

John M. Moore: May I ask the status of our business—what is before us?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): An informal conference.

John M. Moore: Is there any motion before us?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): No motion.

A. J. Lamar: If Dr. Moore will permit me, ought we not to make clear the reason for any action that we take? It was an amendment to the report of the Committee of Eight.

John M. Moore: I was going to ask for the reading of the two resolutions—that is, the two actions of the two Commissions: first, the action of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, which deals with this report that is before us, and then the action of the other Commission, that we can see whether they are close enough together to enable us to proceed under them without separating.

Secretary Harris: The statement from the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, reads as follows:

Dear Brethren: The Commission from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has taken the following action. It took action by amending the report of the Joint Committee of Eight as follows:

Add to the recommendation on the 4th page the following: "*Provided*, that if the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church decides to become a part of the proposed organization the colored members of the reorganized Church shall have and are hereby granted the privilege of organization into an Associate General Conference in accordance with the plan herein provided. In the event that the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church should not accept the invitation to join in the organization of an Associate Regional or Associate General Conference, as proposed above, the Regional Conferences within the territory predominantly Southern Methodist territory shall be allowed to direct their contributions for the colored work to the benefit of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church."

It took action by adopting the following motion:

"*Resolved*, That we approve the report as a basis for determining the status of the negro within the reorganized Church."

It adopted the following resolution:

"Inasmuch as the plan now being worked out involved certain changes in the plan of reorganization as projected by the Joint Commission and approved by our General Conference; therefore be it

"*Resolved by this Commission*, That we do not feel fully authorized to approve them in the sense of being empowered to act upon them at this juncture, but, acting under our general instructions to work out a plan of reorganization, we do approve them as being a part of the only plan which at this time seems possible, and we are agreed that they shall be transmitted to our General Conference with the recommendation that the plan in so far as worked out and agreed upon by the Joint Commission be the basis of reorganization."

This is the resolution offered by the Northern Commission:

Resolved, That this Commission advise the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, that if the Southern Commissioners, without committing themselves to all its provisions, will accept, in principle, the report of the Committee of Eight, this Commission will likewise accept it; and that this Commission recommends that when the report shall have been so accepted by both Commissions, any member of the Joint

Commission shall be at liberty to propose, by motion, in session of the Joint Commission, any change he may desire.

John M. Moore: The Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as I understand that resolution, has asked the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, if it would accept this report in principle.

Secretary Harris: Without binding itself on all the details.

John M. Moore: I understand. Now I want to know if the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church do not see in the resolution adopted by the Commission of the Church, South, that our Commission has accepted that in principle. Is not the resolution an answer to your question?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I am not authorized to speak for the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church in answer to Dr. Moore; but unless I am challenged by some member of that Commission I will promptly answer saying that we regard the action taken by the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, as fully meeting the conditions contemplated in our own resolution and as authorizing us to proceed to the report of the Committee of Eight subject to such an amendment as may be made to it in response to individual motions for amendments in this body.

John M. Moore: I move that we proceed at once to the consideration of this report, item by item, receiving those amendments that may be brought in by either side and giving them due consideration and action.

Bishop Mouzon: It seems to me that before we do that it will be necessary indeed for this Commission as a Joint Commission to accept this report in principle, and I move that we accept in principle the report of the Committee of Eight.

John F. Goucher: I second the motion.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): That is a substitute for Dr. Moore's motion.

John M. Moore: I will withdraw my motion until action on that is taken.

Bishop Leete: As I understand—I think we are thoroughly agreed—all we are really doing is perfecting a plan. We are not making an agreement between the two Churches and we are not now binding our Churches, but we are making a plan to be presented to our Churches.

Several Voices: Sure.

Bishop Leete: At the same time is it not perfectly wise to inject this statement, so that there will not be any question hereafter? because it is so easy afterwards to say you agreed to so and so and you promised so and so. We are agreeing and

promising on a plan to be presented to our Churches, but we are not binding our Churches by the plan that we are perfecting.

Several voices indicated acquiescence with the statement.

Edgar Blake: And neither are we binding our separate Commissions. After we have perfected this report it will go, as I understand, back to the separate Commissions for their final approval.

John M. Moore: Yes.

H. M. Du Bose: I call for a reading of the resolution.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That we accept in principle the report of the Committee of Eight.

Bishop Hamilton: To avoid any misunderstanding, before this motion is adopted, would it not be well for each to understand the other as to what the matter of principle that we speak of here involves, lest after it is adopted some question should be raised that one Commission or the other would say they have acted upon already? That is a matter of principle. Is it not better that we should understand each other? because there are certain questions that will be proposed by way of amendment, wherein I can see that these questions will be raised.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The question before you is the resolution just read.

Bishop Mouzon: In order to make plain what was in my mind in offering this resolution, I will call your attention to Section 4 on page 2, under "Privileges and Powers," and to the preamble under Article VIII. on page 3. It seems to me that the principle contained in this report is set before us very clearly in Section 4 as referred to and in the preamble to Article VIII. referred to.

David G. Downey: I agree perfectly with Bishop Mouzon that the principles that are involved are as stated in Section 4, Article VII., page 2, and in the preamble to Article VIII. Speaking for myself, I desire to say that I consider the main principle involved in Section 4 is representation of all the various Central Conferences in the General Conference. That is the principle, but underlying that principle there may be details and differences of opinion as to the method of settling that representation. Those matters are open, but the principle we accept, at least I do. Further, about Article VIII., I accept and it is my understanding that by principle there we mean the chance for any Central Conference, with the approval of the General Conference, to make a determination as to its future status, and that when once a Central Conference comes to possess 600,000 full members then it has to be erected into what we call here a

Jurisdictional General Conference; but we may prefer to call it something else, and also that the method by which the Central Conference may be advanced is not essentially a principle, but the fact is that the principle and the method are open for further discussion. That is my understanding of principles, and I wanted to make that clear, so that there will be no misunderstanding.

John F. Goucher: I understand that this statement means that we are at liberty to offer amendments to anything that does not violate the general principle; that we need not say that anything not mentioned at this time is estopped from discussion; we are at liberty to make suggestions as we go along in the way of amendments and let the Joint Commission decide whether they are matters of principle.

Bishop McDowell: I am inclined to think that Bishop Mouzon's resolution is clearly not necessary as a parliamentary requirement and will not in any particular way facilitate our proceeding to consider the report of the Committee of Eight. Each of the Commissions, acting separately, has taken a certain general action upon it. It seems to me that, without passing a resolution which clearly comes of a little confusion and excess of caution, the wisest thing is to proceed to consider the report of the Committee of Eight without making this preliminary declaration, which I do not think the parliamentary necessities call for. I would therefore much prefer that, each Commission having said what it has to say, we go ahead to consider this report without acting upon the resolution offered by Bishop Mouzon. I do not wish to vote against the resolution, but with that statement I would be happy if Bishop Mouzon felt at liberty to withdraw that resolution.

Bishop Mouzon: I recognize that Bishop McDowell is correct when he says the parliamentary situation does not demand the motion I made. Nevertheless, if you vote for the motion I have made, you have set forward the business of this Commission just that far and you have agreed to a principle. That word "principle" is a very general word. I have no desire to be asked to define too narrowly what we mean by the word "principle" there. Reference was made to two sections in this report a moment ago. I do not mean that we are compelled to adopt those sections just as they stand, and that they are not open to amendment; but I do mean that the Regional Conference shall be entitled to representation in the General Conference, and that as soon as the Regional Conference shall come to a certain size it shall be erected into an Associate General Conference. If you desire some other name, select it. I have heard it said that a rose by any other name would smell as sweet.

Nevertheless, we are looking into the direction of an Associate General Conference as soon as that can be reached.

Bishop McDowell: Now, will you let me ask you a question?

Bishop Mouzon: Certainly.

Bishop McDowell: Do you regard it as a principle that as soon as the Regional Conference has reached a certain size it shall become an Associate General Conference to be called by that name or some other name agreed upon, but is it also a matter of principle that when it does thus become an *Associate Regional Conference* it ceases to have representation in the General Conference?

John M. Moore: That is provided for.

Bishop McDowell: You see the point I am getting at. I am not expressing my judgment one way or the other; but if it should be now said or implied that immediately upon the erection of the Regional Conference into an Associate General Conference it lost everything except a fraternal arrangement to the General Conference, then we would at once come to the question as to whether that is also a matter of principle or whether that is a matter of method of which and the conditions under which the Regional Conference becomes an Associate General Conference?

Bishop Mouzon: It is my judgment that we do best not to undertake to define too carefully just what we mean by the word "principle." We can agree now in a general way that we accept the principle, and then as we take the paper and perfect it we shall put a more definite meaning on the word "principle."

Bishop McDowell: It is because of the danger of the word and the uncertainty of it that I am unwilling to adopt it, because I fear that it will return somewhere on the way to plague us very seriously.

Bishop Hamilton: That is the very reason I raised the point. I would be very sorry to have any man's motives impugned, and certainly upon the ambiguity of the word "principle." It does not seem to me, if there is a possibility of a question being raised, that we have already voted when the word "principle" is used afterwards to say that we voted in favor of that, and now we are putting a construction upon it that violates what we did.

Abram W Harris: I want to try a substitute, and as the substitute I have before me the action taken by the Commission of the Church, North, so that if we adopt it we are in no greater risk that the Northern Commission is running in adopting this other I move this as a substitute:

Resolved, That we accept the report of the Committee of Eight in principle, but without committing ourselves to all the provisions, and provided that any member of the Joint Commission shall be at liberty to propose by motion any change he may desire.

The substitute was seconded.

Bishop Mouzon: I will accept that in place of the resolution I offered.

Bishop Cooke: I would like to amend by striking out the word "principle" and substituting the words "be accepted as a working basis."

The motion was seconded.

Bishop Atkins: I might throw some light on this word "principle" by an anecdote that some of you have heard before. Up in East Tennessee, where I was born, they are mountain people and are great on principle. One day there came into town a boy with his face all bunged up and both his eyes black and a friend of his said to him, "What is the matter, Bill?" "I had a fight." "You got the worst of it?" He said, "He hurt me right smart, but I am glad I fit." "Well, what were you fighting for?" "He insulted my sister. He said she was red-headed." "Well, is she?" "No, I hain't got no sister." "Well, what in the world were you fighting about then?" "I was just fighting for the principle of the thing."

Edgar Blake: I see the difficulty involved in the use of the word "principle." We had it up in our Commission when we put in our report, and I would like to offer the following, if it is in order, as a substitute for all that is before us, that we accept the report of the Committee of Eight as the basis of a plan for determining the status of the negro and foreign jurisdictions, and that we proceed to consider the same *seriatim*.

Abram W. Harris: I accept that.

Bishop Mouzon: "I have not got any sister."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The substitute is before you and is accepted by Dr. Harris. Is it accepted by Bishop Cooke?

Bishop Cooke: No, sir; this report includes more than the status of the negro.

Edgar Blake: I include everything: "That we accept the report of the Committee of Eight as a basis of a plan for determining the status of the negro and foreign jurisdictions, and that we proceed to consider the same *seriatim*."

Bishop Cooke: That does not include yet all that is before us. I call for the report of the Committee of Eight, and see how much simpler it would be to rely on that report.

Frank M. Thomas: I call for the previous question.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Bishop McDowell: May I understand the question—

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): We are on the previous question.

Bishop McDowell: Can I offer an amendment?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The previous question closes the whole thing.

Bishop McDowell: I want to ask if I can put the words "working basis" in your substitute?

Edgar Blake: That will be all right.

Frank M. Thomas: I object, because I think it is better to stand just as it is, because it is in line with the rest of these things.

A vote being taken, the substitute was agreed to.

Bishop Atkins: Do I understand the words "working basis" are in that?

Edgar Blake: No; I was willing to, but Dr. Thomas objected.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Now, there is nothing before the Joint Commission.

Edgar Blake: It is now within fifteen minutes of the hour of adjournment. It is quite clear that we shall not have time to consider the report at any length, and I move that we do now adjourn.

The motion was seconded, put to a vote, carried, and the Joint Commission adjourned after singing "Praise God, from whom all blessings flow," and receiving the benediction from Rev. R. E. Jones.

ELEVENTH DAY, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1918.

MORNING SESSION.

The Joint Commission was called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Cranston.

Mr. Charles W. Kinne conducted the devotional exercises. He read a portion of James i.

The hymn, "In the Cross of Christ I glory," was sung, after which Mr. Kinne led in prayer.

The hymn, "Jesus Calls Me," was sung, after which Rev. A. J. Lamar led in prayer.

The hymn, "O Thou, in whose presence my soul takes delight," was sung.

Bishop Collins Denny took the chair as presiding officer.

The minutes of the last session were read, corrected, and approved.

Secretary A. W. Harris read a letter from William H. Peters, of the New York Conference.

The roll was called and the following were present: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke, Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon. Ministers: Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, John F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, John J. Wallace, C. M. Stuart, F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, John M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar. Laymen: G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, Alex. Simpson, Jr., R. V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock, M. L. Walton, P. D. Maddin, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves.

Bishop McDowell: I am sorry to announce that Dr. Stuart is ill, and it will be necessary to excuse him.

R. E. Blackwell: Dr. Snyder was called home on account of meningitis in the community, his students being quarantined, and it was necessary for him to be there. He left his vote here and we hope he can be back this evening.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I desire to offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That hereafter, during our sittings, no member shall speak more than once on any question nor more than five minutes at any time.

The resolution was seconded.

Rolla V. Watt: It seems to me that you should add "until everyone else has been heard." It is all right not to let a man speak after he has spoken once, but he might have a remark that would be enlightening.

Bishop Leete: Mr. Simpson does not mean that a man cannot make an additional motion. I think he is referring to formal speeches.

H. M. Du Bose: And the body always has a discretion as to what that rule means.

A vote being taken, the resolution of Mr. Simpson was agreed to.

Bishop Leete: I have a couple of brief resolutions which I wish to offer. It seems to me that the first one has been tacitly agreed to, at least by common consent; but I have felt that we should be relieved of all possible misunderstanding in the minds of the Church at large, and, therefore, I would like to have this a matter of record as well as a matter of discussion. You all know the history of the past. We have sometimes misunderstood each other about matters and have made certain statements as to what was done and what was not done, and we want in this case to avoid any misunderstanding. You will get more thor-

oughly what I am speaking about when I read the first resolution:

The Commissioners on Unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, conceive it to be their duty to present to their respective General Conferences a plan and not a treaty of reorganization and unification. When the work of the Commission is finished and reported to the bodies which created them, those bodies are not bound as to their final action by any agreements reached by their representatives in the Commission.

It seems to me to say that specifically is a protection to all of us on both sides. We have really agreed to that before, and I hope we will also put it into our formal proceedings so that we may point to it at any time.

John F. Goucher: Is not that provided in the action taken by both General Conferences? The representatives of this Church in the Federal Council of such Commissions on Unification are to report to the next General Conference the full details of the plan of unification which may be agreed upon by the Federal Council of Methodism or Joint Commission on Unification for its consideration and final determination. Therefore, I think the final determination is left in the hands of the General Conference. It would only be burdening our minutes with a resolution as to a matter already provided for.

Bishop Leete: My thought is this: It is provided in the plan. This indicates that we are sustaining the provision and acting under it.

Bishop Cranston: I do not see anything very objectionable in that, except it carries with it the intimation of doubt of our own satisfaction with the work we have done or shall do and present to the General Conference. It seems like a work of supererogation when a matter is so plain by the action of the General Conferences themselves. As to informing our people, if it were published at once it would carry the intimation I have named, and if it is not published at once it would have no effect. I do not see the necessity of the resolution and doubt the helpfulness of it.

Bishop Mouzon: I am not prepared to vote until I make one remark. I am sorry that Bishop Leete offered this resolution, for, as has been said, it is a work of supererogation; but suppose I should vote against it. The situation is awkward. If I vote against it, I would seem to say that I did not agree with it, and if the Commission should vote against it we would seem to say that we have powers that we have not. The matter is entirely plain. We can do nothing finally. We cannot enter into any treaty with you, but why should we there say we could not or say that we could? I think the situation would be improved if this paper were withdrawn.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: If it is not withdrawn, I move that it be laid on the table.

Abram W. Harris: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): A motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

A. W. Harris: Can I amend it?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): A motion to lay on the table cannot be amended.

Abram W. Harris: Can I tell how I would like to amend it?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The only thing to do with a motion to lay on the table is to pass it or refuse to pass it.

A vote being taken, the motion to lay on the table was carried by 23 to 21.

Bishop Leete: This becomes a part of the record, does it not?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Yes.

Bishop Leete: I have a right to reserve my personal opinion on the proposition. Now, I have another resolution which I wish to present. So far as I am concerned, I am always willing to be beaten, especially by one vote like that was.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny—Who had voted the six votes which he votes against the motion to lay on the table): I came to your rescue with all the reserves I had.

Bishop Leete: You certainly did your duty, and it is of record that it was proposed and was laid on the table. Now, this resolution:

If it should appear that there are matters concerning which the Commission on Unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, cannot at this time perfect a plan which is satisfactory to a majority of both bodies, it is agreed that these subjects be specifically mentioned as being left open and referred to the consideration of further meetings of representatives of the two Churches, General Conferences, or Commissions.

The resolution was seconded.

Bishop Cranston: Would you not withdraw that until we get through and see where we are?

Bishop Leete: I have no objection, if the matter is kept alive and active.

Bishop Mouzon: I object to that for the same reason that I objected to the other. It is entirely unnecessary; and if we vote for it we have embarrassed ourselves, and if we vote against it we have embarrassed ourselves.

Bishop Cranston: I move its reference to the Committee of Eight, so that it will not be lost sight of.

The motion was seconded.

Bishop McDowell: I think this is the kind of a matter that, if referred, should be referred to the Committee on Procedure.

Bishop Cranston: The thought I had in mind was to put it in the hands of the Committee of Eight, which is making in a fair sense a final report of the matters before it, and this would be the reserve item of the report and could not then be lost sight of. Yet, I cannot say but that, as Bishop McDowell has intimated, the proper place for it to go is to the Committee on Procedure.

Bishop McDowell: I move to amend by substituting for the Committee of Eight the name of the Committee on Procedure.

Bishop Cranston: I accept that.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Then that becomes the original motion.

A vote being taken, the matter was referred to the Committee on Procedure.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I think we are now in the business under the order of the day, and may I be permitted to say a few words, and then call up the propositions one by one so that we can get them up squarely and vote upon them? While the Committee of Eight, strictly speaking, but practically ended their duties when we had made our report to this body, we have held ourselves together for the purpose of considering informally the matters which were referred to in the resolutions from the Church, South, and the Church, North; and among those matters you may remember was one from the Church, North, in which it was desired, if possible, to get away from the use of the words "Associate General" and "Associate Regional" Conferences. For reason the committee got together, and I submitted to them, at their request, a draft covering the first part of the report of the Committee of Eight so as to conjoin together the Regional Conferences No. 1 to No. 11, inclusive, into six Regional and five Sub-regionals, making but one report covering all Regional Conferences from one to eleven. I hold that draft in my hand, and it is really the preference of that committee as a substitute for the report made, and it embodies in it what was tentatively agreed on at Traverse City so far as the six Major Regional Conferences are concerned. I therefore move it as a substitute for that paragraph, and I think we can speedily reach a conclusion on it. This has no reference to Associate General Conferences, but only covers the first two pages of the report before us and the action taken at Traverse City in regard to those matters. Having made it clear, I want to offer as a substitute for the first paragraph of that report the following—if the members will pay attention they will see how the two are joined together, so that there is not the slightest change in the report tentatively adopted on this subject at Traverse City and the report presented by the Committee of

Eight the other day, except in the one particular to which I shall refer when I come to it:

1. Those in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, inclusive, excluding, however, those specified in sub-clause (7) hereof.

Subsection 7 hereof is the negro branch.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): My only purpose in interrupting you is to know what the will of the house is, whether it is to take up this paper before us section by section.

Alex. Simpson, Jr: This is submitted as what the Committee of Eight thinks is a wise provision in place of Section 1.

John M. Moore: Perhaps I should say that the Committee of Eight was called to meet to go over the suggestions that had been made by the two Commissions. We realized that we had no authority whatsoever, as this matter was not referred to us. We had really no rights in the matter; but in order that our Commissioners might be informed, in an informal way, and that the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church might likewise be informed, we thought we might find out exactly what had been proposed and then we might be the means of communication to our men of what the Northern Commission had in mind. We thought by that conference we could get this information to our men. I regret to say it has not been possible for Dr. Du Bose and me, who acted on that Commission, to bring very much information to our men because we have not been able to meet them. While we could not take formal action we were willing for this matter to be presented to the Commission this morning, and it really brings up the paper which relates to the Conferences as a whole. You can understand that Mr. Simpson's purpose is to combine the report on Associate Regional Conferences with the Report on Conferences as it refers to the Regional Conferences. In order to take this up at all the two would have to come together.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The purpose now is to consider and determine what Regional Conferences there are to be.

John M. Moore: That is about what we have come up to.

Bishop McDowell: I can easily see how we can get the matter that was before us on Saturday definitely before us now without any confusion on the basis of Mr. Simpson's statement: What he submits is a statement as to how the matter would appear, on the question of the geographical description of the six Regional Conferences, covering with it the Annual Conferences in the United States. This has not been even tentatively adopted by the Joint Commission; but after he has presented what he is about to present and what he can present, it will be

perfectly competent for the Joint Commission by motion to begin the consideration of the matter at that point: "There shall also be the following Regional Conferences organized," and then the white list and the negro list and the Latin American list and the Southern Asia, the Eastern Asia, the European—and that would get the matter before us now. But in relation to what we shall have to consider afterwards we could proceed by common understanding without any break in the harmony.

Abram W Harris: I move that, under the order of the day, Mr. Simpson have leave to file the plan that he has suggested.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

E. B. Chappell: I would like for him to begin at the beginning again then.

Alex. Simpson, Jr. (Reading):

ARTICLE VIII.

Section 1. There shall be the following Regional Jurisdictions, each having its own Regional Conference, and composed of the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions therein, viz.:

1. Those in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, inclusive, excluding, however, those specified in sub-clause (7) hereof.

2. Those in Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, and North Carolina, inclusive, excluding, however, those specified in sub-clause (7) hereof.

3. Those in Tennessee, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi, inclusive, excluding, however, those specified in sub-clause (7) hereof.

4. Those in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, inclusive, excluding, however, those specified in sub-clause (7) hereof.

5. Those in Minnesota, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, California, Hawaii, and Alaska, inclusive, excluding, however, those specified in sub-clause (7) hereof.

John F. Goucher: May I ask a question?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): If the gentleman submits to it.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Certainly.

John F. Goucher: Would it not be proper to move that this much of the report except the first section be referred to the Committee on Conferences?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I think not. We have reached the time when we must be adopting and not referring. (Continuing the reading):

6. Those in Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona, inclusive, excluding, however, those specified in sub-clause (7) hereof.

7. Those composed of persons of African descent in the United States and in the Continent of Africa.

8. Those in Latin American countries, including Porto Rico, Cuba, Mexico, Central America, and South America.

9. Those in the countries of Europe, in the Madeira Islands, and in Africa, not otherwise provided for.

10. Those in China, Korea, Philippine Islands, and Malaysia.

11. Those in India and Burma.

Sec. 2. *Members*.—Each Regional Conference from (1) to (6) each, inclusive, shall be composed of the ministerial and lay delegates elected to the General Conference by the Annual Conferences within the territory of the said Regional Conference.

Sec. 3. Each Regional Conference from (7) to (11), inclusive, shall be composed as follows:

(a) One ministerial and one lay delegate from and elected by each Annual Conference, Mission Conference, and Mission of its jurisdiction for each 2,000 members in full connection or fraction of two-thirds thereof, provided that each Annual Conference, Mission Conference, and Mission shall be entitled to one ministerial and one lay delegate.

(b) Ministerial delegates shall be elected by the ministerial members of the Annual Conference, Mission Conference, or Mission, and the lay delegates shall be elected by the lay members thereof.

(c) Ministerial delegates of such Regional Conferences shall be at least twenty-five years of age, and shall have been members of an Annual Conference or Mission Conference for at least two years at the time of their election, and at the time of the session of the Regional Conference shall be members of the Annual Conference, Mission Conference, or Mission which elected them.

(d) Lay delegates of such Regional Conferences shall be at least twenty-one years of age, and shall have been members of the Methodist Church for at least two years, and at the time of their election and at the time of the session of the Regional Conference shall be members of a pastoral charge within the bounds of the Annual Conference, Mission Conference, or Mission which elected them.

(e) Each such Regional Conference shall be the judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of its own members.

Sec. 4. *Area and Boundaries*.—The area and boundaries of Regional Jurisdictions from (8) to (11) each, inclusive, may be changed by a majority vote of the General Conference present and voting.

I ought to say that the powers and privileges, the part I am reading now, is the part which was tentatively adopted at Traverse City. The language is a little different from that in which it was adopted, but there is no difference in meaning:

Sec. 5. *Powers and Privileges*.—(1) Each Regional Conference having not less than 150,000 Church members in full connection shall have power to elect, from time to time, the number of bishops allotted to it by the General Conference according to a uniform principle, and said bishops shall be confirmed by the General Conference and ordained by the bishops, unless two-thirds of the members of the General Conference, present and voting, shall object to said confirmation.

(2) Subject to the limitations and restrictions of this Constitution, each such Regional Conference shall have full legislative power over all distinctively regional affairs within its area, including the power to fix the boundaries of Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions, and to provide for the organization of the same; *provided*, that no new Annual Conference shall be organized in the States of the United States

with less than fourteen thousand Church members in full connection therewith.

(3) Each Regional Conference shall also have power to receive, own, transfer, and control educational, benevolent, and charitable institutions of the Church within its own territory which are not otherwise legally provided for, and shall have supervision of all such enterprises, except those which are owned, controlled, and supervised by some other organic agency of the Church.

(4) Each such Regional Conference may, in the exercise of the powers provided herein, make rules or regulations not contrary to or in conflict with any rule or regulation made by the General Conference, for the government and control of the connectional affairs of the Church.

Just at this point the clause relating to the representation of the Regional Conference in the General Conference appears in the report of the Committee of Eight. As there is some slight difference of opinion about that I am passing that by, but will come back to it. All the things I am reading have back of them the unanimous judgment of the Committee of Eight.

Bishop McDowell: Mr. Simpson is presenting this virtually as an exhibit of how this matter would read, but of course it would be subject to the editorial harmonizing that will apply to everything we adopt.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: This is according to the action of this body at Traverse City, and the report of the Committee of Eight combined:

Sec. 6. The powers and privileges of Regional Conferences having less than 150,000 Church members in full connection shall be determined by the General Conference.

Sec. 7 *Meetings*.—Each Regional Conference from (1) to (6) each, inclusive, shall meet for organization immediately succeeding the organization of the General Conference, and at such other times and places as the Regional Conference itself shall determine.

Sec. 8. Each Regional Conference from (7) to (11) each, inclusive, shall meet not more than six nor less than three months in advance of the regular meeting of the General Conference, at such time and place as may be determined, and at such other times and places as it may itself determine.

Sec. 9. Special meetings of any Regional Conference may be convened by the bishops of its jurisdiction, and shall be convened whenever a majority of the Annual Conferences and Mission Conferences of the jurisdiction shall request such special session.

Sec. 10. *Presiding Officer*.—The effective bishops resident within a Regional Jurisdiction shall preside over the session of the Regional Conference thereof, as said bishops may themselves determine; but if there shall be no bishop resident in the jurisdiction of said Conference at the time of its session, the general superintendents shall designate one of their number for such presidency.

Sec. 11. *Quorum*.—Whenever a Regional Conference is in session it shall require the presence of two-thirds of the whole number of delegates to constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but a less number may take a recess or adjourn from day to day, or approve the journal at the final session of the Regional Conference.

Sec. 12. All other matters of procedure shall be governed by rules and regulations as the Regional Conferences shall from time to time prescribe.

Now, the one matter regarding which there is not altogether an agreement is, as I have stated, the question of representation in the General Conference, and that was the subject of a great deal of consultation by the members of the Committee of Eight. As it was presented originally by the Committee of Eight it read as follows:

Each Associate Regional Jurisdiction shall be entitled to be represented by five ministers and five lay delegates.

The result of our deliberation is—I don't mean to say that every member of the Committee of Eight exactly agrees, but it was practically agreed, that I should read this amendment, and I think it does receive the approval of all of them, or did receive the approval of all of them, subject to a little thinking over it, and because it was presented last.

Frank M. Thomas: Will Judge Simpson allow me a question?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Mister, please. I never was a judge.

Frank M. Thomas: Well, Mr. Simpson, then. What authority did this Committee of Eight have to meet informally and take under consideration matters that were not being considered by the Joint Commission and combine them into this definite matter that was committed to them to be brought before this body?

John M. Moore: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Brother Simpson was asked a question.

John M. Moore: I will answer it. None, whatever. I made that statement a few minutes ago. We had no authority, it was not committed to us. We simply met in an informal way to discuss the matter, and that was all in order that we might understand what would take place if this matter were adopted.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): A matter that was a work of supererogation.

John M. Moore: That is to be determined.

Bishop McDowell: Let me say, not having been a member of the committee, since by a former vote we have become an informal body here, I think the members of that committee felt they might meet informally and proceed with certain matters vitally related to their report, but I personally think it was made clear here that they were not reporting this as with authority, but I am certain also that we are very grateful for the report.

Bishop Cranston: May I follow Bishop McDowell on the same line of privilege? I do not understand that this is a report presented for adoption. It is a series of suggestions for information in recognition of this fact, that it is inevitable that

now or some other time ahead the harmonizing of the reports of the special committees with the action of the standing committees will be attempted and must be achieved. I consider that this was for the information of the Joint Commission as to how the matter would work out if those changes were found acceptable. Is that about it?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: If I may add a little, not to what Bishop McDowell has said, but to what Dr. Moore has suggested in answer to Dr. Thomas, we claim no more right to do this than Dr. Thomas would have. We are presenting it because it removes, without a change in the slightest degree in the reports that have been presented and approved—it removes one of the objections made in the consideration of the matter by the Commission of the Church, North, as reported to you on Saturday; and if that can be removed without affecting the matter itself in any degree, it is wise to do it. As it is thus put it does not cross our feelings or prejudices in any way. It is not exactly as Bishop Cranston puts it. It is the purpose of the members of the Committee of Eight, or rather, I should say, of myself as the one who prepared this, at the request of the members of the Committee of Eight, from time to time, to move the substitution of these things I have read for the appropriate paragraph of the report of the Committee of Eight, so that we can dispose of the two matters, the matter of the report of the Committee of Eight and on General Conference at the same time. Having said that, let me refer to a matter upon which we were not agreed, but which we thought at the time of the discussion this morning would be satisfactory, that after the words I read you, which referred to the five ministerial and five lay delegates being in the General Conference from the Regional Conference, it was suggested that these words be added, without altering the other in any degree: "*Provided*, That if the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church joins with the colored membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Regional Conference No. 7, that Regional Conference shall be entitled to such additional representation, if any, as the General Conference may determine, but not exceeding eighteen altogether"; and I may say that the method of reaching eighteen delegates was, that as there were upward of three hundred thousand colored members in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and as it was proposed by the plan to give them ten, and there are two hundred and forty odd thousand in the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, the proposition would be eight, and the eighteen is the limit which they would get.

Frank M. Thomas: I rise to a point of order.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): State the point.

Frank M. Thomas: I make the point that the committee has

no right to bring that matter before us in this form. It was not delegated to it.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Dr. Thomas—

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I think the point of order is well taken. May I add in addition, however, that, as the committee has stated, it does not come before us with any official authority in answer to anything that this Commission has put into the hands of that committee? It displaces the matter before us as if it were simply the act of the eight members of the Joint Commission.

John M. Moore: There are only six. Two of our members were not there.

Frank M. Thomas: If it is a substitute, my point would not lie; but as a report from the Committee of Eight, I stand by my point.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Your point of order is well taken.

Frank M. Thomas: If that is presented simply as a suggestion, all right; but I make the point that it cannot come from the Committee of Eight.

H. M. Du Bose: Let me bring out the point. Did I understand Brother Simpson, under this head, to say that there was a general agreement on this particular point about representation?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I did not say that.

H. M. Du Bose: I entered a special demurrer at that point, and I stated, as the gentlemen present will remember, that I thought it was exceedingly hazardous to raise this question; that we had settled it on a flat ratio.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Let me warn you, Doctor, that a demurrer would not exactly meet that case.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: In order to get this matter before us, I will assume the whole ultimate, absolute, unconditional responsibility for the whole thing with the notice that I gave, and which I intend to carry out from time to time as these sections come up, to offer these sections which I have read as a substitute for the ones we have in the report of the committee.

John M. Moore: It seems to me that Mr. Simpson raises one question which we should discuss. We have named five of these Associate Regional Conferences. We named them, in other places, Subregional Conferences. We have also used the name Missionary Regional Conferences. Now, the question is, Shall we use the words Subregional Conference, or Missionary Regional Conference, or Associate Regional Conference, or arrange them simply in numbers so that the Major Regional Conference will appear from one to six and the Subregional Conferences shall appear from seven to eleven? As I understood

Mr Simpson yesterday afternoon, this arrangement he proposes would not change any of the powers or affect in any way that which we have already put into this report, and which has been tentatively adopted in Traverse City in the report from the Committee on Conferences. His purpose seems to be simply to get rid of the name "Associate Regional Conferences," and allow those Associate Regional Conferences simply to take numbers. I thought it might be well to bring that before this body, although we have no power to report a committee, and let the Commission decide the question of whether or not those Special Conferences shall be numbered seven to eleven, or whether they shall remain as Associate Regional Conferences. That is the question before us, and we should take that and discuss it and decide on what arrangement is to be made.

Bishop McDowell: I think, perhaps, this is an amendment for the motion that I intimated a moment ago I might make, that we now begin the consideration of the paper presented by Mr. Simpson, not as a report from the committee, but as the paper presented by Mr. Simpson at this point.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Will you pardon me just a moment? I am perfectly willing to follow whatever the Commission wants to follow, but we have an order of the day to take this up *seriatim*. Would it not be necessary to reconsider that order and put that in as a substitute to keep within parliamentary usage? I beg pardon for making the suggestion.

Bishop McDowell: If it is the order of the Chair, I shall not object. I was going to move that we take up the consideration of the paper presented by Mr. Simpson at this point, which begins the description of Regional Conferences Nos. 7 to 11, with the discussion of their powers—so much as relates to them.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I would rather take it up all together. It is a complete whole.

Bishop McDowell: May I state why I make this motion? The first part of the paper relates to the geographical condition of the Regional Conferences in the United States. That subject is before the Committee on Conferences. If we go into that debate at this time, we shall sidetrack the debate we have been on up to this time in the last four or five days, and my own purpose in bringing forward this is to continue what I understand to be the order of the day, for to-day, and to complete the discussions we have had on this particular matter with the understanding that, of course, immediately after that the report of the Committee on Conferences will come in.

Frank M. Thomas: Will Bishop McDowell state his motion again?

Bishop McDowell: That we begin the consideration of the

paper presented by Mr. Simpson at that point which embraces the consideration of the Regional Conferences Nos. 7 to 11, inclusive, with their powers, privileges, boundaries, etc.

John M. Moore: I rise to a point of order.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): State your point of order.

John M. Moore: My point is that the order of the day is the consideration of this report on the Associate General Conference, and that must be the basis, that we must proceed in the line of that report, and then receive whatever Mr. Simpson may suggest as an amendment to that report.

Bishop McDowell: I withdraw my motion.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Then it is not necessary for me to pass on the point of order. You save me embarrassment, as you often do.

Rolla V. Watt: I hope we can avoid technical points of order. It seems to me that Mr. Simpson has here offered a very happy restatement of matters tentatively passed upon, and that are before us. There is no change in principle anywhere in the suggestion made by Mr. Simpson, but they bring together the Regional Conferences which we have heretofore considered, with those that we are about to consider, in a most consistent and satisfactory manner, so far as I could judge from the first reading, and I trust, without any technical appeals to parliamentary law, we may proceed to get down to business and find out whether or not we agree on this method.

M. L. Walton: I call for the question.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The question is the order of the day, the consideration of the report of the Committee of Eight, to which Brother Simpson, in his own name and in the names of five other brethren who are members of the Committee of Eight, has brought in a substitute for a certain portion.

Frank M. Thomas: And the names I have not heard. Have you the names of those that consented that that paper should be presented?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I understand, in a parliamentary sense, they presented it as a substitute, and they designate the name sufficiently by saying it was four members from the Methodist Episcopal Church and Dr. Moore and Dr. Du Bose from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

John M. Moore: The members were Mr. Simpson, Mr. Brown, Dr. Blake, Dr. Wallace, Dr. Du Bose, and myself. We took no action. This matter was brought up by Mr. Simpson, and we said we saw no special objection to that. That is the way it came up. It is not a formal presentation by the Committee of Six, but only changes presented by Mr. Simpson.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): So I understood; and I

therefore decided that it came as a substitute offered by the six brethren.

John F. Goucher: If adopted as a substitute, will not that eliminate from consideration everything until it comes to what is termed Section 7? It would be a substitute for Subsection 1 in the article before us.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): As I understood the position in which we are now placed, we had an order of the day, and under the order of the day we are about to consider Article VII. As we entered upon the consideration of Article VII., these six brethren made a motion to substitute for Article VII. the matters that relate to the Regional Conferences and use that preceding portion of what we have heretofore called the Associate Regional Conference.

John F. Goucher: Then it comes up for that, and if so, we move to lay upon the table so much of the substitute as refers to the matter previous to Subsection 7.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That will be in order if there is a second. Is that motion seconded? I do not hear any second.

Frank M. Thomas: I will second it.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The motion is that so much of the substitute as precedes Subsection 7 be laid on the table—that is, if I catch it fully, that all the matter of the substitute pertaining to Regional Conferences as we have heretofore called them be laid on the table.

Rolla V. Watt: There is a much better way to reach it than that.

John F. Goucher: I had presented a motion and I really wanted to modify the motion; but the Chair interrupted and said that it was not seconded, and while I was trying to modify my motion Dr. Thomas seconded, and therefore I think I am still in order to perfect my motion.

Frank M. Thomas: I will withdraw my second to let you perfect it.

John F. Goucher: Thank you. I want to say that, instead of laying on the table, I would move that so much of it be referred to the Committee on Conferences. I do not wish to be guilty of discourtesy. I think that is a wise provision, but when we read a thing the first time we cannot catch it. This would simply postpone the consideration a little longer until the chairman of that committee could report it back to us.

Frank M. Thomas: I second that motion now

Rolla V. Watt: I would like to say that it seems to me we could state, without any harm to ourselves, the theory of Mr. Simpson's proposition—namely, that we will combine these two

sets of Regional Conferences by getting rid of those obnoxious descriptions, and that could be done in a little different way than by referring it to the subcommittee. I would rather adopt the suggestions in principle, and then postpone the further consideration of the first six Regional Conferences.

Bishop Mouzon: On principle I am now opposed to referring to committees anything that we can consider here, for the time has come to act and not to postpone action. There are some of us who greatly fear you may change facts by changing names. There are some who fear that you may not see everything that is involved when you have taken away the name "Associate," and no longer speak of Associate Regional Conferences. The difference remains, and why should we conceal the fact that there is a difference? I rose simply to say that I shall oppose the motion to refer. The time is too late in the session to refer. The time has now come when we must vote and act.

M. L. Walton: I was going to say substantially the same thing. We went over this matter very carefully at Traverse City, section by section. The whole thing was considered very closely, and I believe very analytically. This Committee of Six acted informally. They have reported their action to-day. It will be before us as substitutes for the various sections, and it seems to me that we ought to expedite our business. We have had a great deal of talk and discussion, and points of order and all that, but what we really want to do is to legislate for the good of the two Churches and for the benefit of unification. It seems to me the steps that have been taken, the interest manifested, and the intelligence with which this substitute has been prepared by this committee, chiefly by Mr. Simpson, is very commendable and praiseworthy. It seems to me it meets approval except on the one point. Now, if this matter is referred to the Committee on Conferences, what does it mean? It means a day or days perhaps more of this session. It may protract it another week. If that is desirable, all right; but it seems to me that we ought to be able to meet as intelligent men and Christian gentlemen a situation as presented and not refer this matter.

Edgar Blake: There seems to be a little confusion in the minds of the Commissioners on this point. In striking out the word "Associate" we are not affecting in the slightest degree the status of the Afro-American and foreign jurisdictions. The only thing we are seeking to do is to eliminate a word that is offensive to some of the brethren. I think perhaps we could get at the matter in a way that might meet the approval perhaps of almost the entire Commission. I think it would be unfortunate to postpone or refer. If we intend to take up all these matters of Mr. Simpson, we might as well go ahead now to their consideration.

His paper is an effort to show how, if we strike out the word "Associate," the matter could be worked out without affecting in the slightest the status either of the Afro-American or the foreign jurisdictions—and I would like to offer for consideration the following motion: I move that the word "Associate," wherever it occurs in connection with the words "Regional Conference" or "Regional Jurisdiction" in this and other documents, be stricken out, and that the Afro-American and foreign Regional Jurisdictions be designated by numerals whenever such designation is necessary to distinguish them from the Regional Conferences provided in Article VI., Section 1, of the report of the Committee on Conferences; and provided further, that no change shall be made in the status of the Afro-American and foreign jurisdictions.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That is not in order as a substitute for the motion of Dr. Goucher, which was to refer. Are you ready to vote on that motion to refer?

John F. Goucher: I understand the Committee on Conferences is not yet ready to report; it has not completed its report. It is still meditating on certain changes.

M. L. Walton: I rise to a point of order.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): What is the point?

M. L. Walton: Has Dr. Goucher a right to speak a second time?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Not if anybody else claims the floor; but nobody else was claiming it.

M. L. Walton: He has no right even if no one else does claim the floor.

John F. Goucher: Does that resolution mean—

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I beg pardon, Doctor; I am forced to take you off the floor.

Edgar Blake: I raise the question whether he has spoken since he made the motion.

E. C. Reeves: I want to tell something right here that I heard Sam Jones tell about. He said there was a man suffering from cramp colic, and he was nearly dying, and they sent for a doctor. The doctor had a plaster prepared and he said, "This plaster is made of cayenne pepper and mustard"—and was going on to tell the ingredients when the man said, "I don't care what it is made of, Doctor; I am suffering, and for God's sake clap it on." I think the time has come for us to clap something on and go to work.

Abram W. Harris: Will you entertain a motion for the previous question?

Frank M. Thomas: As the seconder of the motion of Dr. Goucher, I want to make this point. An informal and unau-

thorized number of the committee withdrew from the Committee on Other Conferences a report which properly belongs to that committee and combined it with this report. The point is whether we shall permit this combination and not refer the matter back where it belongs.

Edgar Blake: To correct an impression made by the statement of Dr. Thomas, this Committee of Eight did not withdraw from the Committee on Conferences any part of its report at all. We simply considered the matter of whether this word "Associate" could be eliminated without affecting the status of these jurisdictions, and Mr. Simpson was simply indicating to you that it could be done without affecting in any degree the privileges or powers of any of these jurisdictions.

Bishop McDowell: By order of the Joint Commission, the subject named in the first part of Mr. Simpson's statement is in the hands of a standing committee. That is by formal order. That committee has not yet acted upon its report, has not yet presented its report on that part of its work. I think all parliamentary practice would require that if the Joint Commission wishes to consider the matter that is already by its own action in the hands of that standing committee it should first of all recall it from the hands of that standing committee and proceed to consider it. The members of the Standing Committee on Conferences are not in the least sensitive with reference to this matter. If it is the judgment of the Joint Commission that you want to take up now the consideration of the geographical boundaries of the six Regional Conferences, the members of the Committee on Conferences will interpose no objection.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Some of them will not.

Bishop McDowell: Some of them may, I do not doubt. The committee as a whole has not acted upon that matter, but I think the proper procedure would be before this subject could come before the Joint Commission that we should recall that matter from the hands of that committee. I think the motion of Dr. Goucher to refer is superfluous, because it is in the hands of the committee already.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): But by motion it is brought in here now by six brethren as a substitute for certain reports that came from the committee.

Rolla V. Watt: The whole matter of difficulty will be obviated by voting down Dr. Goucher's motion and adopting Dr. Blake's.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Dr. Blake's motion is not in order under this motion to refer.

W. N. Ainsworth: Let us vote, then.

A vote being taken, the motion of Dr. Goucher to refer was lost.

Frank M. Thomas: I rise to a question of privilege.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): State the question.

Frank M. Thomas: Inasmuch as the motion of Mr. Simpson and these brethren raises in my mind a serious question—I am not concerned about titles, but it raises in my mind a constitutional question as to the concepts of these Conferences—I move that the Commission of the Church, South, be privileged to withdraw for a few moments to discuss their attitude to this question.

E. C. Reeves. I second the motion.

Bishop Cranston: I have been wondering if our brethren are thinking the same thing. I just ask Mr. Simpson if the arrangement proposed in that—I will not call it a report, but in that informational document, in any way changes the relation of the African and Missionary Conferences and the Regional Conferences as to their respective functions? He says it does not change the plan which has been proceeded upon up to this time, that it is simply a question, I think, covered by Dr. Blake's proposition, to change the name or leave the name as it is. Here we have six Regional Conferences provided. There shall also be other Regional Conferences, as the African, Eastern Asia, Southern Asia, etc., with functions provided for elsewhere in this Constitution, not identical functions with the Regional Conference, but such functions as may be defined by the committee and agreed upon. Now, that is very different.

Bishop McDowell: It seems to me I ought to say that the motion Dr. Thomas made indicates a desire which ought to take precedence for the moment of everything else. If the Commissioners from the Church, South, desire to withdraw, they should be accorded that privilege.

Frank M. Thomas: I withdraw that for the moment. In my judgment we are getting into a constitutional difficulty.

Edgar Blake: Now, is my motion in order?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I would hear the motion.

Edgar Blake: If the brethren of the Commission will take the report of the Committee of Eight, Associate Regional Conferences, all we desire to eliminate is the word "Associate." We do not desire to affect the status of these Afro-Americans and foreign jurisdictions. The whole question is as to whether you will eliminate the word "Associate," but allow the status of these Conferences to remain, and my motion is that the word "Associate," wherever it shall occur in connection with the words "Regional Conferences" or "Regional Jurisdictions" in this or in any other document, be stricken out, and that the Afro-American and foreign jurisdictions be designated by numerals whenever such designation is necessary to distinguish them from the Re-

gional Conferences provided in Article VI., Section 1, in the Report of the Committee on Conferences, provided that no change shall be made in the status of the Afro-American or foreign jurisdictions thereby.

Bishop McDowell: I would be willing to second that motion with the understanding that it does not take for granted nor carry with it the implication that the Joint Commission has adopted the geographical designations of the six Regional Conferences, which it clearly has not.

Edgar Blake: That does not affect that at all.

Bishop McDowell: I wanted to make that perfectly clear. I second the motion of Dr. Blake.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The motion of Dr. Blake is before you.

R. E. Jones: Does the adoption of this resolution of Dr. Blake's fix the name of the Afro-American and foreign jurisdictions?

John M. Moore: Now that is exactly the way that matter was presented yesterday afternoon, simply change the name "Associate" to numbers, not affecting the Associate Regional Jurisdictions, but having these Conferences that are Associate Regional Conferences in fact, and those that are Missionary Regional Conferences in fact, simply changed so that they would be numbered from seven to eleven. So far as I could see personally, there would be no objection to that. I do not know how my own brethren feel about it, but in talking to some of them last night I found that they were opposed to making any change whatsoever, but were for holding to the name "Associate Regional Conference" as it is now used. I think this brings it squarely before us, and our Southern Commissioners ought to say whether or not it is acceptable to us. I suppose it is acceptable to the Northern Commission or it would not really have been brought in in that way. So, it is a question for us Southern Commissioners to act upon, and decide what we shall do.

Bishop McDowell: I suppose the effect of Dr. Blake's motion is to bring before us exactly the question that Dr. Moore now states, whether the Joint Commission will or will not designate certain Regional Conferences or Regional Jurisdictions by a special form, such as Associate or Sub or Racial or what-not, and I rise to say that the proposition submitted by Mr. Simpson, which for the moment I am considering wholly as a personal suggestion in which he is joined by two or three other members of the Commission, and not as a report of the committee at all, which it clearly is not—I regard this proposition as altogether desirable and wise and right. I therefore trust that the

motion made by Dr. Blake may receive the concurrent vote of this Joint Commission of the two Churches. I see no gain whatever in using a title which may constitute in any degree a reflection, or in any way raise a question in the minds of people to whom such title is applied. And I am speaking now not exclusively—indeed I am not thinking chiefly of our negro brethren. I am thinking of our foreign missionary jurisdictions, of our brethren in Europe, Latin America, and in Asia and other jurisdictions which are designated similarly by numerals. They are very large geographically and very large in their ultimate possibilities, and I would not like to fix a title on them that would be regarded as a reflection or in any way a discrimination. It is sufficient discrimination that we are changing their representation in our General Conference. Their size already creates a sufficient discrimination, and I am utterly unwilling to affix to them any title which in any way might embarrass our work among them, for I am thinking of that also, the relation of our Church to its mighty work in Latin America and in Asia and Africa. You can afford, when you have such great strength as the united Church will have, when you have these six great Regional Conferences, if that is the number finally adopted, and the tremendous General Conference that would follow—you can afford to be exceedingly magnanimous toward those parts of the world that you are seeking to win, and one of the ways by which you can win is to avoid a term that will of itself constitute an obstacle to approach.

George Warren Brown: I wish to submit a fact: In all our talks on the Committee of Eight—and Brother Moore will bear me out—it has been the unanimous expression of our brethren on that subcommittee of the Southern Church, that the name did not matter a particle, just so we did not change the status of the powers. I have also talked with a number of other Southern brethren and I have not had any other note than that. Now, what is there to lose if, as provided in this motion of Brother Blake, we simply go on the broad principle of using a distinctive numeral to take the place of a description which might be offensive? We are getting this thing shaped up to get the most out of it for the kingdom. This is a reorganization or a reuniting of Methodism. Why should not we be big and broad and go forward?

Frank M. Thomas: Brethren, if we were dealing with missionary politics, it might be a different matter; but we have before us a Constitution that must be accepted by the two Churches. Mr. Simpson knows there is no Constitution in the world which differentiates between legal bodies of different houses by numerals.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: On the contrary, I know to the reverse.

Frank M. Thomas: Name one.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: The Constitution of Pennsylvania is the one I had in mind.

Frank M. Thomas: I am not familiar with that.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Then you should not make so broad a statement.

Frank M. Thomas: I submit where you draw a distinction between powers and privileges, that distinction should go into the name. It must go into the names when calling a constitution, at least according to my way of thinking, and my Church will demand that these distinctions be set forth in some way. I do not care what they be, so that they be just. I am a minor until I am twenty-one years of age. You may call me a senior, but you could not make me a senior. There are fundamental principles in life that you cannot obliterate by mere notations. We are building a constitution. It is not a mere matter of good will, but we are fixing certain jurisdictions in this great world Church, and we cannot, merely to avoid a question here or there or a question back home or a question of polity, afford to get away from the fundamental conceptions that we started out with the other day. The word is not a word that I would stand for, but the concept with which we started out the other day was a division of Conferences in their privileges and powers, and upon that basis we committed that matter to this Joint Conference to be worked out, and here they abolished the nomenclature.

Bishop Hamilton: I do not rise to discuss this question, but to make some inquiries. I do not like the implication that seems to be made here. I cannot conceive that our brethren in the Joint Commission who are from the South want to put into the names of these Conferences such designations as would be a reflection anywhere. If they do, let them say so. And I am not having just in mind the negro.

Frank M. Thomas: Will the Bishop allow a word?

Bishop Hamilton: Surely, always.

Frank M. Thomas: Has there been any intimation from the Church, South, that we wish to put in any name that is a reflection anywhere?

Bishop Hamilton: That is what we want to clear up here in the Joint Commission. We do not know what you brethren mean by giving them names. I am not just having in mind now the negroes; I am having in mind Europe. There has been no designation that will be acceptable to Europe. We have adopted the designation of Missionary Regional Conferences. Our bishop over there is doing everything in his power to secure self-support for all these Conferences in Europe. If we

are to designate some of these as Associate Conferences and Missionary Conferences, I think it will be a mistake. Brethren who have no associate relations have been over there because there is nothing that severs them from us but language, and what name are you going to give them? Let us know what you brethren mean. Is this a purely constitutional question?

Frank M. Thomas: Certainly.

Bishop Hamilton: That is what I wanted to find out. Then, how are we to put in the name of Europe, for instance, with the negro so as to satisfy you in a constitutional way? I simply want you brethren to tell us about it, and then when we know what you mean we can consider it.

Bishop Cranston here took the chair as presiding officer.

Bishop Denny: Let me explain, so far as I am concerned—and I knew nothing of this matter until I heard it while sitting in the chair. I have had no consultation with my brethren, but from my knowledge of them the thought of putting a stigma by a name on anybody or on any Conference would not be within the fringes of their imagination, much less within their purpose.

E. B. Chappell: Why should anybody raise that question?

Bishop Denny: Yes, why? If it were in anybody's mind as has been mentioned, I am glad that it came out, so that up to the measure of my ability I can sweep it into oblivion. Here is the way some of us look at it. A name is not simply a sign. Names are needed to keep things from falling back into the confusion out of which they have been called. Take a rose: we call it a rose not simply to give it a sign, but also to keep it from falling back into that unanalyzed or undistributed mass of things. A name is intended also to be a designation, a description of so many functions. We may use a name that will enable those who hear it to understand the functions belonging to it. I hope that is clear to you. It is perfectly clear to my own mind. It would be perfectly clear to anybody I had the privilege of sitting in the same class with. You propose to put in simply numerical designations—numbers to designate these Conferences. Even to the numerical method there are objections. I have found some men in my own section of the country so small that they have abused me because in writing the names of these two Churches I have always put it Methodist Episcopal Church and Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Why? Courtesy demanded it, and will continue to demand it. They were foolish enough and small enough to say, when our brethren of the North did not put us first when they wrote, "Why don't you treat them in the same way that they treat you?" and I replied in the language of the Scripture: "If I salute my brethren only, what do I more than

others?" I mention that simply to show that there is a significance even in the use of numerals. Now, brethren, what do you accomplish? I know I am on the ground of analogy, and that it is a probability, but we are living in a peculiar age. Some of us do not quite understand what will be the outcome. We have taken occasion to range over some of the fields that represent historic facts. We are forgetful of the fact that on one occasion, as Euripides said in a play of his that was comparatively recently discovered in Egypt, the women in a certain Greek island, in the advocacy of their rights and in their opposition to men, determined that they would have their rights, and they murdered the last man on the island and seized the government. We don't know what is coming in the future, but suppose you try this. I am not making this statement for any purpose except to let you know a fact that you may not yet have considered, because you have not crossed it and I might never have crossed it except by turning over the pages of a book accidentally on a table. Suppose we say we want to indicate a policy between husband and wife, but we don't like any historic subordination that rests in the word "wife." Therefore we will say, instead of husband and wife, one and two. I do not care who is one. What I am after is to bring before you brethren just what we are likely to fall into, unless you are careful to remember that we are not able to overturn the entire continent or the gain that the human mind has made in this matter of denomination. It cannot be done. The world has not worked for centuries on that question and there left it for us to come along and sweep it right off the board; I am not talking of technicalities, I am not talking of logic, I am not speaking of philosophic occurrences alone, but I am trying to bring before you the present thing that underlies the whole business. A name must present, to be intelligent and forceful, something of the functions that belong to the thing to which the name is given, some of the qualities to be found in the thing when you analyze it. I do not care anything about Associate Regional Conferences, but we should express in the names the functions of these two bodies. I would be perfectly willing to accept any word at all that is any sense descriptive of those functions. I do not believe it would be wise to say that we should simply fall back into the numerals and say one, two, three, four, five, six, and seven. In the Constitution of the United States or of most of the States in this country with whose Constitutions I happen to have some acquaintance (and, in the language of the Epistles to the Hebrews, I hail many of them at a distance)—in all these Constitutions the powers of government are divided into Legislative, Judicial, and Executive. Suppose some State would say, "We do not like

those designations, therefore we will say Department 1, Department 2, and Department 3." Is it not perfectly clear to every man, who for a moment considers it, that an immense loss would take place? The moment we now say "Legislative," you do not only give the name, but you carry the import into the name of the functions that you are familiar with from the very beginning of Anglo-Saxon traditions, and the same is the case when you say Judicial or Executive—both those names carry their functions with them. I tried to throw out the suggestion the other day that there is an atmosphere carried by certain words. Now, suppose you simply name these Conferences one, two, three, four, five, six, and seven. Don't you see how much you have lost? I am glad, personally, that Bishop Hamilton brought it out. It is not that any one wanted to stigmatize any Conference. On the contrary, I should be glad to use any name that is favorable to them and acceptable to them; but this matter of naming goes down not simply below the surface, it goes down to the very foundation of the work we are undertaking.

Bishop Leete: I find myself in a considerable measure of agreement with Bishop Denny about this matter of nomenclature. I have this objection to a mere numerical designation, that it serves little purpose to indicate what is meant. It is just like the numbers in the army, though I think the plan is redeemed in part in the army by the fact that the regimental divisions are designated not simply numerically. They have another designation, because they also represent some territorial region. That which appeals to me about the question before us is the connotation in the mind of all people of the particular work represented. I am willing for some other word to be used to designate the various bodies. I do not think there is anything that stigmatizes anybody in "Associate Regional Conferences" or that any such thing was intended—very far from that. I do think there is a meaning of this word "Associate" that we ought to avoid, however, and I am perfectly certain if we do not avoid it we shall defeat this whole proposition. I want to call your attention to the fact that the word "Associate" means "outside of" or "related to in some way," but not a part of any institution which may be described. Now, I do not want to be associated with my wife; I want to be married to her. This fact I stick to, and I note the fact that in mineralogy there is a law called the law of paragenesis, that minerals do not occur singly in nature, but in associated groups. For example, take the group in which gold is an element. Gold is always found with a certain number of associated minerals, not always all of them, but always some of them and sometimes all—for instance, silver, antimony, quartz, lead. These are associated together in a group,

and the word "paragenesis" is applied to that group, because in some way or other not well known to scientists the same cause that operated to produce one must have operated to produce the others which are found with it. What I call attention to is that gold is not a part of lead nor is lead a part of gold in any way, shape, or form whatever. We are trying to make a Church of which we are all to be parts, but "Associate" means that we are not a part of it. This is going to be resented among our European, Asiatic, and American friends—in fact, everywhere. Now, let me take another figure. I study birds and flowers in the summer, and have noted that two birds are always associating, the crow and the kingbird. Wherever you find the crow you will find the kingbird, and the interesting thing is that the kingbird is always after the crow and the crow is always trying to get away from the kingbird. The little kingbird just naturally makes the crow hustle. So it is possible to be associated without any consanguinity and with harmony, or with positive discord. The word "Associate" has a meaning that does not express exactly what we mean. I will follow Bishop Denny to this extent. I am perfectly willing to adopt a definite nomenclature, but I want it to be one that in no sense implies inferiority on one side and that does not in any sense impute superiority on the other, indicating a mere association, just an arrangement without any real relationship to the Church as a whole. We have done a good deal, in our thinking of it, and I do not know what will be the final conclusion; we have reduced the representation of the foreign Conferences. When some people find out what they have left in the General Conference, they are going to get their axes and hatchets. The European people are sensitive. They are as much in the world as we are, and they propose to be a part of something or else not to be. I am afraid some will leave us. The Asiatics are about as sensitive as the Europeans, and the colored brethren, we know, are also sensitive. We have reduced their representation from 80 or 90 to 12. At least, let us name our divisions so that they will not be in any way offensive, or we shall have a combination of associated parts that haven't a string left with which to hold them together.

J. H. Reynolds: I do not rise to discuss the question so much as to ask for information. I think that we are all agreed that nobody here wants a designation that will be regarded as a reflection on anybody. We will make progress, too, if I frankly say that the Southern Commissioners are interested in the question of the constitutional bearing of the proposal, and I therefore inquire of Dr. Blake or any one who can explain it, what, if we adopt this proposal, will become of the constitutional safeguards guaranteeing to regional delegations in the General Con-

ference the right to vote as regional delegates—that is, the right to go apart and vote as regions?

Frank M. Thomas: And elect bishops?

J. H. Reynolds: Yes, elect bishops. I think if that were explained it would help us to see a little further into this question. Do I understand that this would give eight or ten delegates, say from Region No. 7 or Region No. 8, the right to go apart and nominate bishops?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: It is expressly provided that that shall be done in the Regional Conferences, as to all from 7 to 11.

Frank M. Thomas: 7 and 11 are well-known figures.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I have heard of them before now.

J. H. Reynolds: Suppose we were to divide one region into two regions; how would you number it then?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: All that would be done when it was divided.

J. H. Reynolds: That leaves it in the power of the General Conference to determine the functions that it should have at the time of the division of the regions.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Certainly not. Whenever they are divided they have the same powers as the regions from which they were divided. If No. 5 were divided, each branch would have the same power as the whole No. 5 had before.

Abram W. Harris: Would the name or number in any way affect the action if everything else were identical?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Not in the slightest degree.

J. H. Reynolds: I am not sure, unless there are special provisions to the contrary, that the constitutional safeguards heretofore provided for the section on Conferences protecting minority rights by authorizing regional delegates in the General Conference to go apart and vote separately would not be disturbed by the proposal.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: There are special provisions right in that paper as I read it to you.

R. S. Hyer: To clarify matters, may I ask Mr. Simpson how it would affect paragraph 4, under the head of "Voting," in this report of the Committee on Other Conferences? Have you made any change in that paragraph, page 7 in the report of the Committee on Other Conferences?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: There is nothing here said upon that. Your Committee on Style and Final Arrangement could arrange that without difficulty.

R. S. Hyer: I think the whole question raised here this morning is largely dependent upon that. If that be the understanding, so far as I am personally concerned, I would not object to numbering; in fact, my objection to numbering is largely based

on the constitutional objection in that Section 4, and also the election of bishops.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: There is not the slightest trouble. If the Commission gets together and meets from day to day and then adjourns and meets from period to period, it is impossible to have everything fit into everything else and read as a concatenated whole without editing. I never knew of any convention that did not require at the end a Committee on Style and Final Arrangement to straighten out the forms and remove the difficulties which would otherwise arise by the adoption of various things at different times, and after long-drawn-out debate. Just as we met the point Saturday in turning your Regional Conferences into Associate General Conferences, we failed to arrange anything about bishops.

Edgar Blake: May I call Dr. Hyer's attention to the fact that it will be necessary to conform all these paragraphs to the resolution we have adopted, and under Section 4 of paragraph 4, to which you have referred, it might be about as follows: Whenever a majority of any two of the original delegations from Jurisdictions 1 to 6, inclusive, shall so request, a vote shall be taken on any pending motion or resolution, except an amendment to the Constitution, by a Regional delegation, and it shall require a majority of the members thereof present and voting to carry the same, provided that no motion or resolution shall be adopted that does not receive a majority, etc.

Frank M. Thomas: May I suggest that we are making the Constitution?

David G. Downey: A point of order.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): State the point.

David G. Downey: I make the point of order that we are not making the Constitution, that we are not, even as Joint Commissioners, part of the Constitution-making power of the Church or of either branch of the Church. We are preparing a plan to be submitted to the General Conference and the Annual Conferences, which are the Constitution-making powers.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I think the point is not well taken, because we shall have, among other things, to prepare a good many things for the Constitution.

David G. Downey: Will you rule on this specific point: Are we legally a part of the Constitution-making power of the Churches?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): We are not, but that does not apply to this debate.

David G. Downey: I think it applies to the argument or statement that we are making a Constitution.

E. B. Chappell: Well, we are.

Frank M. Thomas: What we are doing now will become a part of the Constitution.

David G. Downey: It may, or it may not.

Frank M. Thomas: If they adopt it, it will.

David G. Downey: But then, they will be making the Constitution.

Frank M. Thomas: That is rather technical.

David G. Downey: Purely technical, as a good many other things that I have heard.

Frank M. Thomas: I want the Commission, South, to understand that what we are framing will be part of the Constitution of the reorganized Church. If not, I am very much mistaken. Now, I want to ask Dr. Blake a question. Under the powers of the Regional Conferences, the Regional Conference is given certain powers and those powers are named. Now, if you put into the Constitution that Regional Conference No. 7 shall have certain powers and then the boundaries of that Conference are changed so that by nomenclature No. 7 passes to another, how could you correct that without changing the whole Constitution?

Edgar Blake: I cannot answer that in the abstract. Mr. Simpson probably can.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I did not hear the question. Gentlemen were talking near me, and I could not hear it.

C. M. Bishop: It occurs to me that, after all, our difficulty is purely one of name, one of nomenclature, and that we have discovered through this wandering in the wilderness for a whole half day that we have a real point, a matter of real importance to deal with in fixing upon the name. Is "Regional" what we want? Does it set forth what we are doing? Does it declare what we mean as to these Conferences and Jurisdictions? Not in every case. It does not set forth all we need. Moreover, it is not a Regional Jurisdiction that we make altogether. Jurisdiction No. 7 is not distinguished as a region from Jurisdictions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6. It is really another sort of distinction that we are making. It is a different thing. The arrangement for foreign Conferences under the present designation is not strictly Regional, but other matters enter in. There are questions of language which determine or affect our judgment with reference to the relation of the various portions of these various regions. Region, therefore, is not exactly the word that we want to use. We are not designating precisely what we are doing by the use of that term. Now, then, when we use an indefinite or inaccurate term like that to describe two distinctly different kinds of groups which together constitute the great Church we have gotten into further confusion. There is no doubt about that. We

are in confusion now. Can we not find some word in the history of the Church which will be more nearly accurate perhaps, and which will at least serve to make perfectly clear to us constantly the distinction between those sections of the Church of the United States which we proposed originally to constitute as Regional Conferences, and the other group of members in the Methodist Episcopal Church whose relation to the Church in the body or with which the Churches' influences, if you wish to say it that way, are somewhat different? There is a difference between the relations, on the one hand, of the six first-named groups to each other, and the relations of those six groups to the remaining groups and the relations of the members of the remaining groups to each other. There is certainly a striking difference which we ought to indicate some way in our wording. I am sorry I am not prepared to suggest the nomenclature. Will some brother who happens to know tell me what the etymology of the word "synod" is? Two or three brethren have suggested it to me, but I am sure they are guessing at its meaning and I am sure I am guessing myself.

Bishop Cooke: It has its root in the Greek σύν, meaning "with."

C. M. Bishop: I think so too, but what is the rest of it? I suggest that it is not a Methodist term, and I suggest that we introduce ecclesiastical terms and accurate terms. Let us make a distinction so that we can all get together and understand each other and there will be no question whether anybody wants to put anything over. Occasionally that sort of an unpleasant thing comes up, but we are not trying to get the best of anyone. We are frank with each other. We are not yielding to a desire to diplomatically get an advantage on either side. Nobody believes that. Now, we are in trouble with a little personal question of what the other man does mean.

Bishop McDowell: I want to ask the Doctor a question: Would it answer what is in your mind at this point if a system of names like the following (I don't offer it as a final proposition, but just by way of illustration), Northeast, North Central, Northwest, Southeast, Southwest, South Central, European, Latin American, Eastern Asiatic, Afro-American—would a series of names like that as applied to the regions meet what is in your mind?

C. M. Bishop: Not quite, because Regional is there, and it does not mean the same thing as Regional No. 1 does or Regional No. 10. There is a distinction between the six primary regions into which we divide the white membership and the other regions, and it seems to me we get upon our cross and will be crucified unless we make the distinction clear as we proceed in the making of this Constitution, which I think we are doing.

Bishop Cooke: Would "coördinate" help?

C. M. Bishop: That doesn't seem to be "coördinate."

David G. Downey: Replying to Dr. Bishop's speech, I think we see the difficulty before us, and we want to get some sort of series of names which would distinguish not only locality, but by their association would also distinguish powers and privileges. There are three names that have been talked about. We have talked about Regional, Central, and Jurisdictional. Now, I wonder if we could arrange these in groups—say the first six, which are really Regional, might be called Regional Conferences. Then take Nos. 7 to 11, and they might be called Central Conferences or Jurisdictional Conferences. Then when we come to what we have thought of as the Associate General Conference, if we take Central for the other, that could be classed Jurisdictional, or if we take Jurisdictional for 7 to 11, that might be called Central. I suggest these names with which we are somewhat familiar and further suggest that we apply these names to certain specified groups. The powers and privileges would attach themselves to the name, though they might not be absolutely embodied in the name, and the name will connote the powers.

Edgar Blake: Let me call attention to a provision in the Discipline of our Church: "When in any of our foreign mission fields there is more than one Annual Conference or Mission, if ordered by the General Conference, it shall be lawful to organize a Central Conference, to be composed either of all the members of those Annual Conferences or Missions, or of delegates from the same, elected according to such ratio as may be agreed upon between the constituent parties, who may also provide for the admission of laymen to such Conference, the number of Lay Delegates not to exceed that of the Clerical Delegates." We do have now in our Church Central Conferences for Eastern Asia and Southern Asia and one for Europe. I do not think we have any for Latin America. "Central Conference" is a designation that our foreign jurisdictions are accustomed to seeing. It is familiar to our people, and if you want to secure a name that will carry with it the thought not only of the area, but of the functions, if you please, of a given group of those jurisdictions, it seems to me we can find that name. I think the suggestion made by Dr. Downey is a most admirable one. I shall be happy to support it if he will make a motion to that effect—namely, that where the words "Associate Regional" are used we substitute the word "Central." I shall be glad to second that if Dr. Downey cares to make that motion, so that we shall have a name that our foreign jurisdictions are accustomed to.

John J. Wallace: Six months ago I suggested the use of this

word "Central," on the basis of what Dr. Blake has just said; after wrestling with the matter and trying out "synodal," which I personally prefer, and some other names for these Conferences, I caught just the point that Dr. Hyer raised, that it would be necessary to have a name to distinguish this group of Conferences from the others, so as to preserve all the constitutional provisions in the tentative plan. I drew up a plan for such Conferences substantially as we now have it, using this word "Central." Some of my brethren did not like it and some did. I shall be greatly pleased now if the suggestion of Dr. Blake shall be acted upon, and I move that we adopt "Central" as the name of this group of Conferences.

Bishop Leete: When you come to No. 7, I would say "Central Colored Regional Conference."

Edgar Blake: Central Conference, Article 7: "There shall be the following regional jurisdictions, each having its own Central Conference," and then naming them.

John F. Goucher: I have no special anxiety about the name, but when a thing is new you can hardly ever find an old name to fit it. So, I think we cannot find any term to designate the thing that we are trying to establish. Personally, I do not like the word "Central." It is not enough to make a contention over, but with six Regional Conferences in the United States I hardly like to say "Central Conference."

Bishop Leete: May I ask a question?

John F. Goucher: Certainly.

Bishop Leete: Would you be willing to have the Central Colored Conference and the Central European Conference?

John F. Goucher: There is no objection to that especially, except that I object to the word "Central." I don't like that name "Central."

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): We are getting into confusion, brethren.

John F. Goucher: I am not.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): You are not plural.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Personally, I have no feeling whatever about numbers or names. I do not care which it is. I have a very strong feeling that it shall not be so done as to be in the slightest degree offensive to anybody in any one of these Jurisdictional Conferences. We had far better avoid, as I view it, all kinds of nomenclature than to do anything like that. After all, language is but a means of conveying thought, and if you can convey a thought other ways than by a name which is objectionable, you have accomplished the real purpose intended. There was a gentleman up in the part of the country where I came from whose name was Hogg. Of course the proper pronuncia-

tion of that was H-o-g Hog, but he with his family insisted that the name should be pronounced Hoag, and of course, every gentleman of his acquaintance now calls him Hoag. I think this Commission should do the same thing. As I understand it, those in Regional Conferences 7 to 11 object principally to being set apart, not by reason of any particular name except that they be Sub or Associate. They want to be carried together in the plan and Constitution of our Church as nearly as may be, for the good of the Church, exactly as every other body in a comparatively like situation with themselves is; and they feel that if they are not thus carried in there is going to be in the minds of a number of their own members a feeling that they have been in some way made subordinate. I object to any man's being subordinate. There is no man in this Commission subordinate to me. God helping me, I look on every man here as my equal in everything, and if any man is in this Commission whose name is Hogg and he wants me to call him Hoag, I am going to call him that, or I will call him No. 7, or whatever he wants; and if part of our members want to be called 7 to 11, if they desire to be numbered rather than named, I ask you brethren, so long as we don't give to them any rights or privileges other than what would be given to them under these other names, why not let them have the numbers?

A. F. Watkins: If there be an inferiority, why not say so? It is not a personal inferiority. It is a racial inferiority. If this is a Missionary Jurisdiction, why not say so? And are we not untrue to the facts in the case when we refuse to say so? If this Conference believes that there are different kinds of Regional Conferences proposed, that some of them are entirely self-supporting and missionary in their attitude of helpfulness, and certain others that are missionaries in the sense of being the receivers of the missionary activities of the other six who, under the spirit of the Lord Jesus, are attempting now to carry the gospel to those who have it not, why refuse to make that distinction which exists in the very logic of the thing? Are we not here with our ears to the ground? Are not we on the Southern Commission wondering what the effects of this change will be in that hard fight that we may have to make with conservative constituencies in order that we may induce them to bring about this thing that we believe for the glory of God? On the other hand, are not our brethren from more Northern parallels standing with their ears turned toward the homeland, realizing the difficulties that will come in the confronting of their people? Don't we have to think of the effect on our constituency?

Bishop Leete: Somewhat properly so.

A. F. Watkins: I say so, too. I therefore say that this propo-

sition, illogical as I believe it to be, and not true to the facts in the case, is going to make more difficult the acceptance of the plan in the section from which I come, and I am therefore not in favor of it.

Bishop Cranston: Referring to what Dr. Watkins has said, that there is an inferiority, I mean a subordinate relationship, it is not, of course, unchristian to designate some people as beneficiaries. We all, I presume, have those who look to us for aid; but if one happens to have poor kinsfolk to whom he renders aid, they do not wish to be continually reminded of his benefactions, and it wouldn't be right to put that in their name. I came here with a plan in my pocket. I have not brought it forward, because I did not think it was opportune. I do not think it is opportune now; but there is one feature of that plan to which I have become attached, and I think right here is the place to mention my preference for the word "Jurisdictional." I can see an appropriateness in that word as applied to these divisions that have been called Subregional Conferences. I would prefer it to Central Conference, or any other name. There is, under every form of government, necessity for jurisdictional administration. The word "jurisdiction" carries a specific meaning with it. If we could give that name to these five Conferences for which we are trying now so hard to find a designation, I think we would cover exactly their relations. I would suggest the following clause: There shall be the following autonomous jurisdictions: The Jurisdiction of Eastern Asia, the Jurisdiction of Southern Asia, the Jurisdiction of South America, the Jurisdiction of Europe, etc. These would be so many jurisdictions of the Methodist Episcopal Church and hold this relationship by constitutional recognition with certain rights, covered under that general name. As to the Associate General Conference, I cannot see the objection to Associate coupled with General Conference. It indicates dignity and coördination of authority. It indicates honorable affiliation. Associate coupled with General Conference indicates the very powers which you are proposing to commit to that body.

A. J. Lamar: I do not rise to add any light to this discussion, but to what I might call a question of privilege of the body. We are now within five minutes of adjournment. We have spent the entire morning session on preliminaries. At this rate, we shall never get anywhere, and I want, in this five minutes, to offer two resolutions in the interest of economy of time and for the purpose of securing some definite action from this Commission before we adjourn finally or at least finally for this session of the Commission. The first is this: I appreciate the courtesies of the occasion and what moved our Chairman to overlook the

length of time the speakers were consuming. And after he did that in one case he could not do differently in another, but now I move that our Chairman be requested, urged, and instructed to rigidly enforce the five-minute rule from now on.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That will be understood without any further motion so far as I am concerned.

A. J. Lamar: My second motion is that we fix the time of final adjournment of this session, and I move that we fix Wednesday evening at six o'clock as the time for final adjournment. I think if you do that and enforce your five-minute rule we shall greatly expedite matters.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Dr. Blake's motion is still before us. Is there unanimous consent to take up these two motions of Dr. Lamar's?

Bishop McDowell: He makes only one.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): On reflection I think I had better put both. I hear no objection. If you will adopt the first motion that the Chairman is requested and urged and instructed to rigidly enforce the five-minute rule, indicate.

A vote being taken, the motion was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Now, the motion is that we fix Wednesday at six o'clock as the hour for final adjournment.

Rolla V. Watt: I move to amend by fixing it at 12:30.

John F. Goucher: I move as an amendment, Thursday at six o'clock.

A. J. Lamar: I accept Mr. Watt's amendment.

Several Members: No.

A. J. Lamar: I am urged by so many not to accept it, that I am compelled to withdraw my acceptance.

Edgar Blake: I move to lay on the table the amendment fixing 12:30 as the adjourning time.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That was not seconded. I did not understand Mr. Watt's motion to have a second. I understand that Dr. Lamar accepted it. Then Dr. Lamar withdrew his acceptance, which leaves Dr. Lamar's motion the only motion before us, and Dr. Blake withdraws his motion to lay on the table, and if you adopt Dr. Lamar's motion you will please indicate it.

A vote being taken, the original motion of Dr. Lamar was carried.

Bishop Cranston: That is, of course, subject to reconsideration.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): We are within two minutes of the hour of adjournment of the morning session.

Edgar Blake: It seems to me that one thing we ought to settle here before adjournment is the matter of name. Shall we

designate these several jurisdictions by numerals or shall we designate them by name?

Bishop Mouzon: Will Dr. Blake pardon me? We must extend the time or we cannot finish this matter. I move an extension of time until one o'clock.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: It seems to me that the Commission should first settle the principle of whether we shall designate these by names or by numerals, and if by names then vote on the names, and we can clear the whole matter up quickly. I move that we designate these jurisdictions by names rather than by numerals. With the consent of my second, I withdraw the other motion that I made.

The motion was seconded and, a vote being taken, the same was carried.

Abram W. Harris: I move that we adjourn to meet at half past two o'clock.

The motion was seconded.

Edgar Blake: And I move to lay that motion to adjourn on the table.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Now, Dr. Wallace's motion is that we designate the Conferences enumerated under Article VII. as Central Conferences.

Bishop Mouzon: A while ago our good friend Mr. Simpson referred to an acquaintance of his whose name was Hogg, but who refused to let himself be called by that name. Once upon a time, in the good State of Texas, we had a great Governor whose name was Hogg and he called himself Hogg, and furthermore the story runs that he had a boy whose name was Ura Hogg and he had a girl whose name was Ima Hogg. I think that is a true story, but whether it is fable or fact, the principle is all right. A name ought to mean something and not something else. In a certain city in the South, out on the outskirts of the city, there is a good church, and the name that that church takes for itself is Central Methodist Church. It is in the outskirts, but they have taken that name, and if it suits them it suits me. I shall not contend about names, but I insist that the term "Central" has acquired a certain meaning among the brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church which is contrary to etymology and the usual significance of that word, and it seems to me quite certain if we would call these outlying jurisdictions "Central" and that pleases the brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and will help them to get this matter through, that we should be entirely willing to call them "Central." I shall not object at all. There should be some differences in those names,

and if the name "Central" is what you prefer and will help you in the matter, I stand perfectly willing to support the name "Central" rather than "Jurisdictional."

W. N. Ainsworth: It has been stated here this morning several times that no change in the powers of any of these Conferences is contemplated. I take that at its face value. That being true, I think we have wasted a good deal of time. It is all a question of name. The objection that Bishop Mouzon has suggested will disappear if you will slightly change the verbiage at another point. These Conferences are to be central as to a particular jurisdiction. They are not to be Central Conferences for this reorganized Church, but to be central as to a particular jurisdiction. I do not know that I caught the exact language of Dr. Wallace's proposition. He may have it exactly as I propose. I propose that it read this way: "There shall also be constituted the following jurisdictions, each having its own Central Conference."

Edgar Blake: That is the motion exactly.

W. N. Ainsworth: Then I am ready to vote for it.

A vote being taken, the amendment was carried.

John M. Moore: Does that carry with it the idea that the Central shall be used throughout Article VII.?

E. B. Chappell: Jurisdiction, I think.

John M. Moore: Shall we say "Each Central Conference shall be composed as follows"?

Bishop Mouzon: No, each Jurisdictional Conference.

John M. Moore: Each Central Conference.

Bishop Mouzon: That is right.

Edgar Blake: That is merely a matter of editing, is it not?

John J. Wallace: Make it "Central" throughout.

Edgar Blake: Now, I think we are under Article VII.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): We had before us the substitute offered by Brother Simpson. That was practically the Regional Conferences, and the matter before us now would be, "There shall be the following Regional Jurisdictions, each having its own Regional Conference."

Edgar Blake: Each having its own Central Conference.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Its Central Conference under the Regional Conferences. Brother Simpson moved that we take up his statement of the eleven Conferences to be discussed by numerals.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: As I understand the action of the Commission, its voting against numbering really ends all that.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Then it is understood that the five under Article VII. are up for consideration.

Assent was given to this statement.

Edgar Blake: May I call attention to the fact that the Joint Commission has already adopted or approved tentatively two, three, four, and five of the Committee on Conferences and that leaves us with only No. 1? I understand there is a desire to amend No. 1, and in order to bring the matter before us, I move that we tentatively approve Section 1, paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. It is desired to change the Afro-American.

Bishop Hamilton: I do not want to do anything that our brethren who are here called the Afro-American do not desire. I know there is some difference of opinion in the colored membership. I think Brother Jones doesn't care to have that word "Afro-American," because he says he is an American and doesn't want any hyphenate. I understand that there are objections to calling it "negro," and I want to know if Brother Jones will accept "Central Colored" Conference instead of "Afro-American."

R. E. Jones: Since we have passed the recent amendment I am not sure what I would suggest. At first I thought of some such designation as this: "There shall be a Central Conference composed of our colored work in the United States." First, we do not like the term "Afro-American," because at this particular time that hyphenates our patriotism. We are all Americans through and through. There would be some objection by some of our people to the term "negro," and here is another distinction I would like to get before you. I would like to have it read, "There shall be a Central Conference in America composed of our colored work." That does not put under the "Afro-American" jurisdiction certain white men and women who are doing missionary work in the South, but when you say "Afro-American Jurisdiction" that makes all our white teachers who are doing missionary work among the colored people in the South under the Afro-American Jurisdiction. Now, there is a National Association of Teachers in Colored Schools that would take in the colored teachers and white teachers doing work in the colored schools. Some such phrase as that I suggest would meet all objections on that score and would not take in those white people. I could give you a concrete example. We have in South Carolina Dr. Dutton. We have said a great deal here about mixed Conferences. Dr. Dutton is a member of the South Carolina Conference, and I would not want to do anything that would give offense to that man who has given a half a century to the work down there in South Carolina. You have met that situation in your own Church somehow or other in administering the Paine Institute. I don't know how it is done, but I would be perfectly willing to this: "There shall be a Central Conference in America"—I don't know how you can term

it—"composed of the work among our colored people." I would like to think over that a little if you are going to fix a name, but I insist that we do not call it "Afro-American."

Bishop Cranston: I would like to ask the brother's attention again.

R. E. Jones: All right.

Bishop Cranston: Where would you assign the work in Africa?

R. E. Jones: I have no objection to attaching it to this Conference. Really, I don't know where I would assign it.

Bishop Cranston: That is a big question and a vital one.

R. E. Jones: I don't really know. You complicate it when you undertake to bring delegates from Liberia and all that West Coast of Africa to our Central Conference. Then you have the matter of administration. The way we are administering our work in Africa to-day through the Foreign Missionary Society, all our missionaries in Africa to-day except those in Liberia are white missionaries.

Bishop Cranston: Under the direction of the Missionary Board—

R. E. Jones: —but members of the Central African Conference of those Missionary Conferences—Dr. Springer and the others.

Bishop Hamilton: I would like to substitute this, if it is agreeable to Dr. Jones: "A Central Conference for our colored membership."

Bishop Leete: Is it not a fact that Dr. Jones did not hear what just passed a few moments ago which is practically in line—

R. E. Jones: I think I caught it, "There shall be the following jurisdictions, each having a Central Conference"—

Bishop Leete: You want to name it now?

R. E. Jones: Yes.

Edgar Blake: May I call attention to the fact that we do not need to name these jurisdictions, that all we do is to define, "There shall be constituted the following jurisdictions, each having," etc., and not name them at all.

Bishop Cooke: Where does Hawaii come in?

Edgar Blake: No. 5.

R. E. Jones: Will you read that again?

Edgar Blake: Composed of the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions of African descent.

I. G. Penn: I do not want the impression created here that our people are going to make any great trouble over that name. They will be perfectly satisfied with what Dr. Blake has said. Dr. Blake's wording exactly will be satisfactory to them.

Edgar Blake: I move that the paragraph be amended by striking out "Afro-American, embracing within its jurisdiction," and the words "in the United States," so that it will read "The An-

nual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions composed of persons of African descent."

Bishop Cranston: I want to second that. That brings the whole matter into the exact line of my thinking.

H. M. Du Bose: I am not a purist, as you will have discovered, but I believe in selecting words with some reference to the matter that they are intended to describe, and to have them as nearly exact in that relationship as possible, and it occurs to me that the word "colored" is much better than the words "of African descent." More particularly, as I understand, Dr. Jones prefers that form. It stands in exact relation to the term that has been used in this paper and that inevitably will be used to describe them. Here we speak of white people and they are in exact antithesis of that. It seems to me that the word "colored" is very much better than the words "of African descent."

Edgar Blake: It is immaterial to me.

H. M. Du Bose: Dr. Jones prefers "colored." I move to strike out the words "of African descent" and insert the word "colored."

John F. Goucher: As to your being a purist, you ought to know how far you are willing to deviate from the usual standard. Would that word "colored" necessarily include Chinese who are yellow, or Hindustans who are brown?

H. M. Du Bose: The word has come to have an ethnic meaning as applied to the African race. We can describe the others as Eastern Asiatic, Indians, etc.

Bishop McDowell: May I call the attention of the gentlemen of the Commission, and particularly of our Commission, to the fact that in the boundary of the Annual Conference our Discipline describes those Conferences in this fashion: "The South Carolina Conference shall include the colored work in the State of South Carolina. . . . The Savannah Conference shall include the colored work in that part of the State of Georgia. . . . The Texas Conference shall include the colored work in so much of the State of Texas," etc. "The Upper Mississippi Conference shall include the colored work in the State of Mississippi." That would exactly follow our usage, and I think it would be in harmony with our general desire.

Rolla V. Watt: I move that we now adjourn in order that these members can get together and have the wording exactly right for us at the afternoon session.

The motion to adjourn was seconded.

Bishop Leete: Is that debatable?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I think not.

Bishop Leete: I wanted to offer a resolution which is germane now.

Rolla V. Watt: Then I withdraw it.

Bishop Leete: Everything depends on the way our transactions are reported to the public, and already some Associated Press dispatches have been going out and they have misrepresented us, for we are getting telegrams indicating that there is some difficulty in understanding what we have been doing. I move that from this time on no announcements go to the Associated Press.

Rolla V. Watt: Why say "Associated"? Why not say "press"?

Bishop Leete: I will say "press" then: that from this time on no communication as to actions be given to the press which is not authorized by this body itself.

The motion was seconded.

T. N. Ivey: I rise to a question of privilege. The motion to adjourn was not seconded.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): This is a privileged motion that Bishop Leete has brought up.

A. J. Lamar: I am not opposed to that motion, but I think it would be entirely inoperative, and I doubt whether it would be wise. I believe one of the best things we could do for our people, North and South, would be to let them know as speedily as possible through the press everything that may be done.

Bishop Leete: I thoroughly sympathize with that, but what I am saying now is that I object to the sending out of unauthorized news, or rather something that one or two or three people think is news.

A. J. Lamar: You cannot help their reporting unauthorized stuff.

T. N. Ivey: There is nothing before the house.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Bishop Leete's motion is before the house.

J. H. Reynolds: What should be regarded as authorized news, and who is constituted as the authority through which this news is to reach the public?

Bishop McDowell: Bishop Leete's motion was perfectly clear on that.

Bishop Leete: By the body itself. It should be brought here and sent out from the body.

I. Garland Penn: This is a very important matter, because telegrams have been received from certain sections of the country where we have a large membership inquiring if there has been action at this Joint Commission making a separate General Conference for the negroes in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and that that is the information that has been given to them, as I understand it, through the Associated Press dispatches with what has been published in some of the papers in this

city, and if we want to send out any statement let the authorized statement be sent out by the Secretary and the people of the country will have the exact facts.

Frank M. Thomas: It is extremely important that the news that goes out from this body should be correct. I have been approached time and time again by newspaper men requesting information and I have refused to tell them anything.

Bishop McDowell: Is it not true that there has been published a tentative geographical outline with a map of what we are doing?

Frank M. Thomas: I have heard that, but I did not see it.

Bishop McDowell: I saw it.

C. M. Bishop: I saw the outlines in the press, and the same day recognized two newspaper reporters in this room. A lot of our printed reports were lying around rather loosely, and I dare say a reporter picked up one of them.

W. N. Ainsworth: I rise to a question of privilege at this moment. Certain representatives of the local press have come to me and said that they had in their hands copies of some of these printed reports. I do not know whether they were given to them by members of the Commission or whether they picked them up here when they would be coming to speak to members of this Commission; but in every instance where I have had any knowledge of such papers being in their possession, I have said to them that they had no right to use them in any way, and in no case has any local paper used any of the papers that have by chance fallen into the hands of their reporters. I am in no sense their representative, but I am glad to say they have been fair and just in handling these things.

A vote being taken, Bishop Leete's motion was agreed to.

T. N. Ivey: I have in my hand a copy of the report of the Committee on Other Conferences. Unfortunately for myself, it does not belong to me. This is the first copy I have seen. I have been present at every meeting, but in some way or other I have failed to secure a copy of that report.

E. B. Chappell: That is not completed yet, and you have no right to the copy that you have.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The meeting is adjourned by limitation of time.

The hymn, "Praise God, from whom all blessings flow," was sung, and the session was dismissed with benediction by Dr. Wallace.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Joint Commission met pursuant to adjournment, and was called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Collins Denny.

Rev. Albert J. Nast conducted the devotional exercises.

The hymn, "Children of the Heavenly King," was sung.

Dr. Nash read the first chapter of Peter.

The hymn, "Go, labor on; spend and be spent," was sung.

The roll was called and the following were present: Bishops Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Ministers: F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar, Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. J. Wallace, C. M. Stuart. Laymen: M. L. Walton, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock.

The minutes of the morning session were read and approved.

Bishop Earl Cranston took the chair.

Secretary Thomas: The question is on the name of the Afro-American Conference.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): State it in its entirety. Perhaps it will be more satisfactory.

Edgar Blake: The motion was to insert in paragraph one. First it was to strike out the word "Afro-American" and the words "in the United States," and insert the words "composing the work among our colored people."

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: That word "composing" doesn't make good sense. "Composing" does not read very well there.

John M. Moore: No, it should be "embracing" or "comprising."

John F. Goucher: I suggest "including."

A. F. Watkins: That would imply that there was something else.

Frank Neff: I suggest "organized for."

Abram W. Harris: I move that this be referred to the Editorial Committee.

Edgar Blake: How would this do: "The Annual Conferences, Missionary Conferences, and Missions among our colored people"?

John F. Goucher: Why not say, "to include our colored people"?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): We all know what it means. Let Dr. Blake wrestle with the title.

Edgar Blake: I don't want to do that.

Bishop Mouzon: Let it read this way: "The Annual Conferences, the Missionary Conferences, and Missions composed of colored people."

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: That is all right.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): All right; is that acceptable?

R. E. Jones: There is just one objection to that, as I tried to state this morning; because of our educational work in the South, with which certain men are related. We have colored Conferences; I suppose it will not be many years before Conferences will be made up entirely of colored people, but there are now at least two connections in Tennessee and South Carolina where white members have been affiliated very closely with us. I want the educational work left in its present status.

Bishop Mouzon: Then I suggest this: "The Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions embracing the work among the colored people."

John M. Moore: That is all satisfactory.

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

A. J. Lamar: Has that been adopted?

Secretary Thomas: Yes.

A. J. Lamar: Then I want to give my personal reason for voting against it. It seems to me that provides for mixed Conferences. Fearing I might not be right, I asked Brother Penn, and he says it undoubtedly does, and that is why I am against it.

John F. Goucher: I am anxious to have three statements cleared up. There have been three made as to this section No. 1, and no two of them agree. Now will some one explain which is right?

Frank M. Thomas: Here is the way the opening clause reads: "There shall be constituted the following jurisdictions, each having its own Central Conference."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Are we now ready for No. 2?

Secretary Thomas: Yes.

E. B. Chappell: No; first I move that the section as we have amended it be adopted.

M. L. Walton: I want to ask as to the provision of this first section. Will those provisions authorize the holding of mixed Conferences? I voted for it with the idea that nothing of that kind would occur; and if that is a fact, I want to move a reconsideration of the road by which that first section was agreed to.

Bishop Denny: I second the motion for a reconsideration.

Bishop Mouzon: If that is the intent and purpose of it, I should oppose it; but it is phrased thus in order to make it possible for the missionary in Africa to be a member of the Central Conference there, or of the missionary in Georgia to be a member of the Central Conference, and I should certainly not oppose that. My opinion was that everything there is in it, and

if there is anything more, tell us about it, and we will vote against it.

I. Garland Penn: That is all it intended to cover, just the thing that Bishop Mouzon stated in his motion, and I think that is what Brother Jones had in mind and that is all he said.

M. L. Walton: I want a complete understanding about that matter.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): That is not the intent or purpose of Bishop Mouzon. It is simply to meet emergencies which you can hardly take care of any other way.

Bishop Mouzon: Did not Dr. Blake present a paper this morning striking out the first few words of each subsection, "the Latin American, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction"?

Edgar Blake: That was not stricken out. The suggestion was made, but not agreed to.

E. B. Chappell: It is not a matter of sufficient importance to waste time on. I am perfectly willing to go to the extent of accommodating Brother Jones by leaving them off as applicable to the colored jurisdiction, but it will be a matter of great convenience if we could keep those names so that we could understand by designating exactly what was meant. If you ask me what Regional Conference No. 5 embraces, I couldn't tell you. Why, if you do all that way, we shall have to keep the Discipline in our pockets all the time to tell what Regional Conferences are referred to. I think we should keep the names in the other cases.

Abram W. Harris: I want to propose an amendment. I move to strike out the words "including Porto Rico and Cuba" and transfer Porto Rico to the Northeast Regional Conference and Cuba to the South Regional Conference. In the first case, Porto Rico is part of the territory of the United States, and I think ought not to be linked up with a foreign territory. Cuba is in close touch with the United States, and the work in both places, Porto Rico and Cuba, is home missionary work and not foreign missionary work.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Is that amendment accepted?

Edgar Blake: I will not agree to that. The American negro will wonder why a foreign negro can receive more consideration at the hands of the American people than does the American negro. Anybody knows that the Porto Rican is as much a negro as any of our people, and likewise the Cuban. It happens very often that a real black man from Hayti can come to this country and receive more consideration than men born and reared in their own country. I just want to call attention to seeming inconsistencies.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): This is offered as an amendment, as I understand?

Bishop Mouzon: These amendments which we are making are certainly getting us into trouble. Take the one we have already adopted: "The Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions embracing the work among colored people." That will certainly embrace the work in Porto Rico and Cuba and in Brazil, where more than half of our members are colored people. Now, you will have to go back.

George Warren Brown: Haven't we got that "The United States and Continent of Africa"?

Bishop Mouzon: No, sir; "The United States and Continent" were very carefully erased.

Bishop McDowell: Is it intended or not intended to make a jurisdiction of those Conferences that are at work among the colored people? Is it the intention to put those Conferences at work among the colored people partly in one jurisdiction and partly in another, and if so, why? Would the proposal now made put the colored work now embraced in our Colored Conferences and in the Colored Conferences in Africa all in one group and certain other Conferences that really work among the colored people into another jurisdiction? I did not realize that there was this distinction or that this confusion would arise when we passed the original motion as to the first subdivision. Will somebody clear that up?

H. M. Du Bose: I offer that amendment and I understand that this language here would remain and that the designation of the colored work would be reënforced by the words "in the United States of America to include Africa." The other work where there might be a contingent of colored members is in the West Indies and South America in which there are no issues.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): What issue do you refer to?

H. M. Du Bose: The issues that are dividing us here. I certainly understood it would be promulgated as "the work among the colored people in the United States and in Africa, not otherwise provided for."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Can you include in one jurisdiction work administered as home missionary work and also work administered as foreign missionary work?

Bishop Mouzon: I move to reconsider the vote by which Subsection I was adopted, and then I shall move, if you will permit me, that the words "United States and Continent of Africa" come back into that section.

George Warren Brown: I second the motion.

E. B. Chappell: There is an amendment before the house.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): What about?

Abram W. Harris: About Cuba and Porto Rico.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): If Bishop Mouzon will withhold this motion a moment, we will dispose of this other motion. The motion is that Porto Rico and Cuba be stricken out of the second section here.

Bishop Leete: You will have to come to consider how that affects that section numerically. On the question of mixtures there, while there is a mixture in those places, they are Spanish-speaking people and there is a homogeneity that must be taken into consideration.

H. M. Du Bose: You could not separate that work.

David G. Downey: I move that Dr. Harris's motion lie on the table.

The motion was seconded and, a vote being taken, the motion to table was carried.

Bishop Mouzon: Now, I move to reconsider the vote by which Subsection 1, under Section 1, was adopted.

George Warren Brown: I second the motion.

A vote being taken, the motion to reconsider was carried.

Bishop Mouzon: Now, I move to amend by inserting the words that were left out, "in the United States and in the Continent of Africa."

H. M. Du Bose: "Not otherwise provided for."

Bishop Mouzon: No.

A vote being taken, Bishop Mouzon's amendment was adopted.

Bishop Denny: Dr. Chappell has raised a very important point. What is the objection to denominating Section 2 as the Latin American? Why not have a descriptive title which is geographical, and therefore let any one understand clearly what is intended when it is used?

Bishop Mouzon: Since I spoke a moment ago, let me say that the only thing I had in view was to make the phraseology harmonious throughout. I think there is something in what Dr. Chappell has said, and I will vote to let it remain as it is.

C. M. Bishop: The question involved is this: Do you want to name the Churches or name the Conferences? The names as at first used were the names of the Conferences, as I understood it; but now you are establishing certain jurisdictions, and the idea of jurisdiction as we use it here suggests to us the conception of regions and the extent of countries covered. The items as we have proceeded so far in the first subsection constitute a mere description of the territory of the jurisdiction, and it seems to me the Central Conferences of the first jurisdiction might be named by the Conference itself or some other body; and then when you state the country in the second subsection it will

be open to you to name it, and I think we should provide as a preliminary matter whether we are to name the jurisdiction or Conference, and if we name the jurisdictions I cannot understand how we will describe the first jurisdiction.

Bishop Mouzon: The Central Colored.

C. M. Bishop: You have not declared it so here, and there will be no legal way of designating it.

Bishop McDowell: That is not serious enough to involve us, and I think the thing for us to do is to go ahead with uniformity in Subsection 1. We have said the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions embraced among the colored people in the United States and on the Continent of Africa. In point of fact, these jurisdictions and regions will all come to be known by certain names in common and printed speech, and it does not matter much whether we put names to them now or not; but if we are going to be careful to name now the Latin American Jurisdiction and then the European Jurisdiction, in order to be consistent we must name the one that we have established. I do not see any necessity for naming any of them in this instrument.

Edgar Blake: There is a positive objection to extending the names. It is not at all probable that the areas and boundaries of these several jurisdictions which we now fix will remain as we have them. The time may come when Eastern Asia will have to be subdivided, and then we shall be embarrassed by two Eastern Asia districts. We have not undertaken to give names to the Regional Conferences elsewhere. I do not think any confusion can arise by failing to identify those jurisdictions.

Frank M. Thomas: At the first General Conference, will a man referring to them have to give the whole clause to designate them?

Edgar Blake: We haven't had any trouble in knowing what we are about. The motion here was to strike out the words "Latin American, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all," in the first line, and the words "in Latin-American countries, including," in the second line, so that it will read: "The Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in Porto Rico and South America."

Bishop Denny: I move to divide, so as to vote on the words proposed to be omitted in the first line and then on the words to be omitted in the second line.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): A separation, or rather a separate vote, is called for as to each of these words sought to be stricken out. We will take the motion on the first one.

A vote being taken, the first part of the motion was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Now, the second part of the motion, "in Latin American countries, including."

A vote being taken, this portion of the amendment was agreed to.

A motion was made to adopt the section.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): You haven't any first line now. But if you are all satisfied that it is right, it is all right with me.

Edgar Blake: They were not in the printed report and we have not taken a vote on them.

A vote being taken, the whole item was adopted.

Edgar Blake: I move to strike out "European, which will embrace within its jurisdiction all." The section will then read, "The Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in the countries of Europe, in Madeira Island, and in Africa, not otherwise provided for."

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: I now move to adopt paragraph 3.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: I now move to strike out in Section 4, "Eastern Asiatic, which will embrace within its jurisdiction all the," so that the section will read: "The Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in China, Korea, Philippine Islands, and Malaysia."

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: I now move to adopt Section 4 as amended.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: I now move to strike out from Section 5, "Southern Asiatic, which shall embrace within its jurisdiction all the," so that the section will read: "The Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions in India and Burma." I now move to adopt Section 5 as amended.

John F. Goucher: When it comes to the last of page 4, under "Recommendations," second paragraph, we read:

We recommend that in organizing the Afro-American Associate Regional Conference or the Afro-American Associate General Conference the Commission invite the membership of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church and such other Methodist Episcopal Church organizations composed of members of African descent to consider the feasibility and desirability of uniting themselves in the proposed organization.

I want to offer that matter for the reason I have a very definite belief—it is more than an opinion and not quite a judgment, it has not basis enough for judgment; but I believe that the Japan Methodist Church will come into this arrangement, now that we

have eliminated all discrimination, and therefore I raise the question whether it would not be advisable in this clause to add "the Japan Methodist Church"?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): We have voted on the first four, and we are now on No. 5 and Japan is in the Eastern Asia district.

John M. Moore: Let us vote on five then.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): We were about ready to vote on five.

A vote being taken, the amendment offered to five was carried.

Edgar Blake: I now move that the section as amended be adopted.

A vote being taken, the motion was carried.

John F. Goucher: I would like to move that we add "such members of Methodism as are in Japan if they want to unite." I beg pardon for not having thought of it before. There are Methodist Protestants in Japan and there are United Brethren, and I think this ought to be made large enough to invite the Methodists in Japan to unite with us; and if they do unite, they will be included in that Conference.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The Doctor's motion is not pertinent at this point.

Bishop Mouzon: I now move that we adopt Subsection 1 as a whole.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Now, shall we proceed with the other sections?

John M. Moore: Section 2 reads as follows:

Sec. 2. Each Central Regional Conference shall be composed as follows:

(1) One ministerial and one lay delegate from and elected by each Annual Conference, Mission Conference, and Mission of its jurisdiction for each 2,000 Church members in full connection or fraction of two-thirds thereof; *provided*, that each Annual Conference, Mission Conference, and Mission shall be entitled to one ministerial and one lay delegate.

I move its adoption.

The motion was seconded.

Edgar Blake: I desire to call the attention of the Commission to the fact that we ought to place some limitation upon the size of these Regional Conferences. For instance, when one of these Central Jurisdictions contains a membership of 500,000, they would have five hundred in their Central Conference, and it would seem as though we ought to give somebody the right to change the numerical basis from time to time as may be necessary. That is a provision we are introducing elsewhere as it affects the membership in the General Conference, and I would

move that the numerical basis of representation in the General Conference may be changed by the General Conference so as to provide that the membership of the Central Conferences shall not exceed 400 ministers and laymen in equal numbers.

John M. Moore: I am inclined to think that we do not need that. Suppose you have 500,000. You have 500 members in that Central Conference, 250 each. I think they have to have it if they want it, and I don't see any objection to having 500 delegates.

Edgar Blake: It is not a question of their wanting it; they have to have it. Objections might arise to make it unwise to attempt to hold so large a Conference in Eastern Asia or the colored jurisdiction in the United States, and we ought certainly to give some one authority to correct an evil if it arises, and as it is now we cannot correct it except by constitutional amendment.

John M. Moore: Is not the ratio changed by constitutional process now?

Edgar Blake: No; we are providing in the report of the Committee on Conferences that the basis of representation shall be two delegates to each 14,000 members in full connection or two-thirds thereof. And we provide that the numerical basis in the General Conference can be changed, provided that there shall not be more than 850 nor less than 650 ministerial and lay delegates in equal numbers.

Bishop Denny: Dr. Blake has a very important matter before us here, as you will immediately see when your minds revert to the fact that in the adoption of the restrictive rules in 1808 there was fixed a certain proportion of ratio for election of delegates to the General Conference, and in order to change that it was required up until 1832. Every Annual Conference of the connection must vote before they can make any change in those restrictive rules. When it was first carried around through the Conferences it failed, and then in 1828 Wilbur Fisk brought in his amendment and it was an amendment—although somehow or other it slipped out of your Discipline, and it was only returned to our Discipline in 1906—that the present process for the changing of the restrictive rules except the first should be adopted. If we lay on the Regional Conferences any such incubus as requiring a constitutional amendment to change a ratio in their Central Conferences, we see what a burden we put on them.

John M. Moore: Let us have Dr. Blake's amendment.

The amendment was read as follows:

The numerical basis of representation in the Central Conferences may be changed by the General Conference so as to provide that the members of the Central Conferences shall not exceed 400 ministers and laymen in equal number.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Why not let the Central Conferences change it?

Edgar Blake: I don't see any objection to that.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: There is no occasion for the General Conference considering that when the Central Conference knows whether it needs it or not.

A. J. Lamar: Would it not be best to say that the Central Conferences should be allowed to change it in the designated way with the approval of the General Conference?

Edgar Blake: I will accept that.

Dr. Lamar's amendment required concurrent action of the Central Conference and General Conference.

R. E. Jones: I think that is right. I don't think it should be left to the General Conference. I think the Central Conference should have something to do with it, and I think we should have it this way, that the Central Conference shall be composed of the maximum number, the ratio to be fixed by the Central Conference.

John M. Moore: Subject to the approval of the General Conference.

A. J. Lamar: The effect is to give the initiative in the change of ratio to the Central Conference, but it does not become effective until the General Conference approves it.

T. N. Ivey: It simply means that the numerical basis may be changed by the Central Conference, subject to approval of the General Conference.

Edgar Blake: It would read: "The numerical basis of representation in the Central Conferences may be changed by the Central Conference, subject to approval by the General Conference, so as to provide that the members of the Central Conference shall not exceed 400 ministers and laymen in equal number."

John M. Moore: I move the adoption of that subsection as a whole.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

John M. Moore: I move the adoption of the second section as a whole, as amended.

This motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

John M. Moore: The third section reads as follows:

Ministerial delegates of Central Conference shall be at least twenty-five years of age and shall have been members of an Annual Conference or Mission Conference for at least two years at the time of their election, and at the time of the session of the Central Regional Conference, Mission Conference, or Mission which elected them.

David G. Downey: Does that make it possible for a man who is a deacon to be elected?

Edgar Blake: That would permit a deacon to be elected if he is in full membership in the Conference.

David G. Downey: Not in full order?

Edgar Blake: Not in full order.

A. J. Lamar: Would it not be better to make it four years instead of two?

John M. Moore: Dr. Blake wanted that because of the missionary service: a man is in there for two years, and he becomes identified with the Mission. It was his view that a man so identified could be eligible as a delegate.

John F. Goucher: I should prefer that to be four for a variety of reasons, but I shall name only one. I was in attendance at the Central Conference in China when they sent up a good large number of young missionaries. They were voting on a number of important questions. The young men far exceeded in number the older men and the action taken was exceedingly radical and nullified all the possibilities of the Conference doing the best work. A young missionary is very much like a child. A child goes through an attack of measles and then an attack of scarlet fever and other things, and the same is true of people going through teaching. They try all sorts of experiments and finally settle down into the old methods. So, with missionaries, they go through without a comprehensive understanding of the situation and without thoroughly appreciating the significance of things proposed, but finally get steadied down. So, under all these circumstances, it seems to me wise that a person should not enter into a Conference until he is there four years and has opportunity to acquire the language. I greatly prefer the four years.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Do you move that?

John F. Goucher: I do.

C. M. Bishop: I second the motion.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The motion is made that "four" be inserted instead of "two" in the last line.

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

J. H. Reynolds: I rise to a question whether paragraph 3 should not end after the word "election" in line three, striking out all following that, "and at the time of the session of the Central Conference shall be members of the Annual Conference, Mission Conference, or Mission which elected them." This is the reason I raise that question: I know we have some eminent missionaries over there working among those people in China; and suppose such a missionary should hold his membership in a Conference here in America, and yet they might want to send him as their delegate to the Central Conference? I just raise that question and inquire whether that situation could not arise.

Bishop Denny: There is a matter that I wanted to bring up. I cannot see what is to be gained by insisting that a man must be, at the time of the meeting of the Central Conference, a member

of the Conference which elected him. Had such a rule prevailed in our own Church, we should more than once have been deprived of the membership in our General Conference which, within this jurisdiction, is analogous to the Central Conferences now—we would more than once have been deprived of the benefit of some of the strongest men we have ever had in our Conference. If a man be already a member of a Conference and be elected by that Conference and then be transferred between the time of his election and the meeting of his Conference, why should he lose his membership in the Central Conference? He is still in the Church, he is still in the Central Conference, he is familiar with the field, and you deprive the Conference of one of the men whom otherwise they would like to represent them or who would like to be a delegate for them. I am not hanging on the words “represent them in the General Conference.” I do not see that any good can come of this and some damage might result.

David G. Downey: May I ask Bishop Denny a question?

Bishop Denny: Certainly.

David G. Downey: Are not these members to be elected from the Central Conferences intended to represent the various Annual Conferences?

Bishop Denny: Not necessarily. I do not know how you would interpret it.

David G. Downey: I think they are delegates from the Annual Conference.

Bishop Denny: They are delegates from the Annual Conference; but the fact that they are transferred two months before the meeting of the Central Conference would not prevent them from giving all their ability and interest to the Conference that elected them, though in the meantime they may have been transferred to another Annual Conference.

David G. Downey: I judge your practice has been somewhat different from ours. We would have it that they should be members of the Conference.

Bishop Denny: I base it on the experience we had in our Church. It is hardly necessary to mention names, but it may help to call attention to the fact that David Morton was a member of the Montana Conference, and by the Montana Conference was elected to the General Conference. There was a call for him in another field, and between his election by the Montana Annual Conference and the meeting of the General Conference he was transferred. The matter came before our General Conference and it was decided that he did not have to be a member of the Annual Conference which elected him at the time of the holding of the General Conference, provided he was

a member of that Conference at the time he was elected, and we had the benefit of his presence. He was a man of great power in our Conference, one of the most influential men I ever knew. We would have been cut out of such a man as that by a provision of this kind.

Bishop Leete: I wish to call attention to this fact, that in a great many instances in these modern times it is embarrassing for strong men to be transferred to Conferences where their services are eminently needed. In administering one or two cases where we had such men transferred I discovered that these men would forego any opportunity of participating in larger work because, by accepting it, they could not be in the General Conference. We have probably lost the services of several in missionary fields where every temptation should be given them to serve. We should induce them to take hard places, and we certainly should not put anything in that would prevent their participation in the supreme council.

Bishop Mouzon: Another point that might be made. A bishop might transfer men from one Conference to another. Of course, he could have no motives but good motives in transferring them, but it is possible that some bishop might transfer a man in order to prevent him from having a seat in the General Conference.

Abram W. Harris: Is there a motion before us?

Bishop Denny: I have a motion, and will make it now. I move to amend the first line on the second page by striking out the word "the" and inserting "an" and striking out the three words "which elected them," so that the clause would read:

And at the time of the session of the Central Conference shall be members of an Annual Conference, Mission Conference, or Mission.

Abram W. Harris: I second the motion.

Edgar Blake: I wish the Commission would note this fact: It may not be so serious in the case of these Central Conferences, but is likely to be quite serious in case of our Regional Conferences, which we must consider later. For instance, if a man, after his election by the Pittsburgh Conference, is transferred to the Rock River Conference, then when the General Conference follows, three to six or eight months after his election, he will not represent the Pittsburgh Conference. His interests will not be there. His interests will be in another Conference. My contention is that the Pittsburgh Conference, which elects a certain number of reserve delegates, is entitled to have as its delegates men who at the time of the meeting of the General Conference are members of its Conference, and therefore represent it. We have also provided that the delegates elected by the Annual Conference to the General Conference shall constitute the Regional Con-

ference of the jurisdictions from which they were elected. Suppose a man is elected from the New Hampshire Conference, Jurisdiction 1, and after his election he is transferred over to Division 4. Is he then to participate in the election of the Regional Conference when it elects a bishop? I think not. Is he for four years to participate in its Regional Conference as a member when for four years he has not been a member within the jurisdiction?

Bishop Denny: May I be permitted to answer?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Proceed.

Bishop Denny: I am not, under the rule, permitted to again address the meeting.

Edgar Blake: I asked for the information.

Bishop Denny: In the first place, we have delegates and not representatives to the Conference. There is quite a distinction there. We have geographical lines of division which do not in any sense prevent the man who has been working in one geographical division from feeling and caring for the interest of that geographical division, although he has been moved out of it into another geographical division. I believe such a man frequently could give just as good service and valuable service and as true service as any other man, and if you propose to hang on to the word "representative," no less truly representative service with reference to the field where he might be at work, besides it would occur only infrequently, and it does not come to my mind just now that it has ever occurred at all for so long a time as four years would elapse.

E. B. Chappell: I want to call attention to the fact that Dr. Blake has noted a real difficulty. I suggest that there would have to be an additional amendment. You say the "Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions within the jurisdiction," and it might be transferred out of the jurisdiction and you might certainly want that one man.

Frank M. Thomas: That is only in the Regional Conference.

E. B. Chappell: Why not? He could be transferred out of the jurisdiction. He might be transferred from Southern Asia to Eastern Asia.

A. F. Watkins: There is a sense in which these men are representatives of the Conference which elected them. We speak of them as the representatives of those Conferences. It is very evident, however, upon thought of the reasons for the delegated General Conference, that these men were supposed to be taken from the undivided body of the traveling elders, and that while they were to be elected by the Annual Conferences, and in some sense were, indeed, the representatives of the Annual Conferences that elected them, in a much more important sense they

were the representatives of the traveling elders; hence it seems to me to be very desirable that there should be some amendment made in accordance with the suggestion of Bishop Denny. But, at the same time, it occurs to me that in the exceptional case suggested by Dr. Blake there ought to be added to that amendment some limitation like that which Dr. Chappell has just proposed, and which I desired to suggest when I attempted to get the floor.

David G. Downey: I have no doubt but that Dr. Watkins has represented the matter as it was in the beginning; but we have gotten quite a good ways from the beginning, and the Annual Conferences are becoming more and more jealous of their rights. I think that the Annual Conference would feel that it was discriminating against them in the General Conference and in the Central Conference if it were not distinctly provided that the representatives of the Central Conference should at the time of the meeting of the General Conference be members of the Annual Conference that elected them. There may be an occasional injustice, and it is quite likely that once in a while we will miss some wisdom by that plan; but still every Annual Conference, I presume, can elect reserves. These reserves are supposed to be competent to represent them. I think that we shall be entering upon something that will savor somewhat of injustice, not intentional, of course, to the Annual Conference. We must remember that the source of power after all is down in the Annual Conference, and especially in the Annual Conference as it will be constituted hereafter, and I hope that this Subsection 3 may be adopted as it is.

Abram W. Harris: I am in favor of the amendment. The argument of Dr. Blake seems to be directed not against the amendment of this article but of a later article, and the embarrassment arises only if you feel it necessary to do in the other case the thing that we do in this case. It is not necessary to do the same thing in both cases. Dr. Downey's argument seems to me to be a very strong one in favor, not of the position he takes, but of the opposite position. Conferences, as he said, are very jealous of their rights. I think they are, and we may be sure if we leave it upon them to select a delegate or representative, if you please, from the whole Church, they will see to it that that is not often done and only in those cases where it may be wisely done. The whole tendency in the Church is to elect representatives rather than delegates, and we ought not to lay emphasis upon that tendency, but rather to put some checks upon it. I failed of election to the General Conference once because I refused to pledge myself, before I heard the case, against a certain measure which was not pleasing to a majority of that Conference, and I read in the

Daily Christian Advocate that when the man to whose place I would have been elected if I made the pledge voted, he asked permission to say that he did it only because he was instructed, and had he been at liberty he would have voted on the other side. That is not a wholesome situation. There are good examples of what this amendment proposes. If in England the Constitution were like the Article here, Gladstone would have once failed to be returned to the House of Commons. If I am correct in my recollection, and if I am not, I trust that Brother Simpson will correct me.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I do not think Gladstone was ever defeated before any constituency.

Bishop Denny: But he took a constituency heavily against him and won.

Abram W. Harris: I wanted you to help me. I made the appeal to Mr. Simpson before I made the statement, because he was a hair trigger, and if I made a mistake I could never have gotten in my request before he corrected me. If I remember correctly, there is no similar provision to this in our Constitution.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I am sorry to say you are mistaken. I wish you were not, but you are.

Bishop Denny: A man has to be a resident of the district in which he is elected.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: And he has to stay in it.

Abram W. Harris: I am satisfied with the reply. For these reasons, and others I might give if I had time to think of them, I propose to vote for Bishop Denny's amendment at this time.

W. N. Ainsworth: I would apply a different principle in regard to this matter in the establishment of Conferences in the home land and in the mission fields. I am in favor of the Bishop's amendment at this particular point because it relates to work in the mission fields. Far more frequently it might be necessary to transfer a strong missionary from one mission in a given jurisdiction to another than it is to transfer a strong man in a home Conference into another Conference. I would not like for a Central Conference in a missionary jurisdiction to be deprived of the presence and the counsel of a strong missionary who had been elected by one mission simply because he had been transferred to membership in another mission in that same jurisdiction. In the home land, where the Conferences are larger and there are many men of considerable strength, there would not be so much chance to lose by this situation, and I do not know that I would be for Bishop Denny's amendment as applicable to the home field, but I favor it in the mission field.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Perhaps I may be speaking out of a

boundless ignorance, as on many of these subjects I am, but it strikes me that the underlying thought is the protection of the Conference which elects a man, and if that Conference having elected him desires to retain him, it should be permitted to do so. My suggestion is this, that in place of that which is proposed at the end of the section we put these words, "But may, at the option of the Conference which elected him, be superseded by a new election if he ceases to be a member of the Annual Conference, Mission Conference, or Mission which elected him." That would carry out the idea of protection.

A. J. Lamar: The difficulty in that is that the Annual Conference which elects the man to the General Conference has no meeting before the General Conference.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: They could call one if they wanted to.

A. J. Lamar: It seems to me that the thing involved here is that you fear the Annual Conference will not be properly represented because the man has been, for a few months, out of that Conference. Our people at home do not act on that principle. I am a member of the Alabama Conference, and I have not done any work in the Alabama Conference except some speech or address, helping some brother in a meeting, for a good many years; but the Alabama Conference thinks I am fit to represent it, for it has elected me to the General Conference four times since I have done any work among them and since I have resided within their boundary, and that is practically true of almost every connectional man, North and South, that his Conference continues to send him, though he does not reside in the boundaries of his Conference, and he is not as intimately connected with the work of his Conference as he was formerly.

Frank M. Thomas: I move the previous question.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The first vote will be on Bishop Denny's amendment.

A vote being taken, the amendment was carried.

E. B. Chappell: Now, I move that we add "within the jurisdiction"—

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): What about the previous question?

E. B. Chappell: I did not know we were under the previous question.

John M. Moore: Had we not exhausted the previous question?

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The motion was to adopt the item.

Bishop Denny: No, I think it was just to adopt the amendment.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Then proceed, Brother Chappell.

E. B. Chappell: My motion is that we add the words "within the jurisdiction."

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Where does that come in?

E. B. Chappell: After the word "missions."

The motion was seconded and, a vote being taken, was carried.

John M. Moore: I now move that we adopt the section as a whole.

The motion was seconded and, being put to vote, was carried.

John M. Moore: Section 4 reads as follows:

Lay delegates of a Central Conference shall be at least twenty-one years of age and shall have been members of the Methodist Church for at least two years, and at the time of their election and at the time of the session of the Central Conference shall be members of a pastoral charge within the bounds of the Annual Conference, Mission Conference, or Mission which elected them.

David G. Downey: I would like to inquire the reason for making the age twenty-one in the case of a layman and twenty-five in the case of a minister, and requiring only a two years' membership in the Church?

John M. Moore: Answer that, Brother Blake, please.

Edgar Blake: It is hardly conceivable that a man who has been two years on probation and four years a full member would not have reached twenty-five years of age, though that might occur. That was one reason why twenty-five was fixed as applying to a minister. Then it was thought a man of twenty-one, if he had been a member of the Church for two years, would be quite competent to represent his Annual Conference, Mission Conference, or Mission in the General Conference. I do not think it is a matter of very much importance, but I sometimes think that we do not start our young laymen in early enough.

Rolla V. Watt: It takes longer than that to go to the General Conference in America.

Edgar Blake: Yes.

Rolla V. Watt: I move that we make that four years.

Edgar Blake: If you want to, you can make it twenty-five, and require them to be members of the Church five years.

Rolla V. Watt: I would think that would be much better.

David G. Downey: I think twenty-three for the age, and four years' membership in the Church.

Edgar Blake: Why not make it the same as the other then?

Rolla V. Watt: I cannot see any reason why laymen in these Conferences should be able to legislate earlier than laymen in America, where the member may have been brought up all

his life in the Church, and I move that that be made the same as in America.

Edgar Blake: I second that. That means twenty-five years of age and five years in the Church.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: You have four years instead of two, have you not, in reference to ministers?

Edgar Blake: Four years a member of the Annual Conference, Mission Conference, or Mission which elected them.

John M. Moore: I would rather make it four. A man may have been a semi-Christian and come into the Church, and he may have developed until he could represent his jurisdiction in the Central Conference very well.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): There are two figures named, four and five. We will take a vote as between four and five.

A vote being taken, it was decided that five had the majority, and the section was changed so as to require the age to be twenty-five and the length of membership in the Church to be five years, applicable to lay members before they could be delegates to the Central Conference.

Bishop Denny: I now move that we make the same corrections in this Subsection 4 that we made in Subsection 3, and the reasons are very potent to me. Suppose, for instance, an American has been laboring in some business house in Shanghai and has been a member of the Church there, or any other city would do just as well for an illustration, and he is transferred in his business just before the meeting of the Central Conference to Yokohama or Nagasaki? We ought not to lose the benefit of that man in the Central Conference because his business arrangements have taken him from one city to the other which crosses the Conference line, and I therefore move to correct this so that it may read in harmony with the section adopted.

Edgar Blake: That would require him still to be a member of a pastoral charge within the bounds of the jurisdiction.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): That would be "within the jurisdiction" instead of "which elected them."

Bishop Denny: Yes.

Rolla V. Watt: I suppose the words "Methodist Church" in these sections will be changed to whatever name is finally adopted.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Yes, of course.

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

John M. Moore: I now move the adoption of Section 4 as amended.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

A. J. Lamar: Brother Simpson calls my attention to the fact that in Article III., which we have adopted, on page 1, there

should be this change: "Or" stricken out before Mission Conference, and after "Conference" should be added "or Missions." It now reads, "Shall have been members of an Annual Conference or a Mission Conference," and I want to add "or Missions." It is so everywhere else.

David G. Downey: Is it not true that members of Missions are always in an Annual Conference?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: It appears as Brother Lamar suggests in Subsection 1 and Subsection 2, and it ought to be corrected here in this Subsection 3 to conform.

A. J. Lamar: If it is omitted here, it ought to be omitted wherever it occurs elsewhere, and if it is left in the other places it ought to be here.

John M. Moore: The idea is that this man would have to be a member of an Annual Conference or a Mission Conference; that is, he should have some Conference relation, not simply be a member of a Mission.

Edgar Blake: The word "Mission" is not necessary.

John M. Moore: And it is not desired.

John J. Wallace: Let me call attention to the fact that the preferential report had a provision for the election of reserves.

John M. Moore: We did that on purpose, to let them take care of that matter.

A. J. Lamar: This copy that I have here has "member of an Annual Conference, Mission Conference, or Mission."

John M. Moore: That should be taken out. It should be "shall be a member of an Annual Conference or Mission Conference."

Edgar Blake: You will be in trouble if you do that. In the first place, we are providing the qualifications for election as a delegate. We provide that a man must be four years a member of an Annual Conference or Mission Conference. Is that clear?

A. J. Lamar: Yes.

Edgar Blake: Now, we provide that at the time of the session of the Central Conference he shall be a member of an Annual Conference or Mission Conference or Mission within the jurisdiction.

A. J. Lamar: I see.

John M. Moore: Section 5 reads, "Each Central Conference shall be the judge of the election, returns, and qualifications of its own members." I move the adoption of that section.

The motion was seconded and, a vote being taken, was carried.

John M. Moore: Now, I move the adoption of Section 2 as a whole.

R. E. Jones: I want to call attention to one matter in Sub-

section 2. If we are to have lay delegates in the Annual Conferences, it ought to be corrected. "The lay delegates shall be elected by the lay members of the Annual Conferences." We don't have in our Annual Conferences lay delegates.

John M. Moore: That is contemplated in the Constitution already adopted. Mr. Chairman, I have moved the adoption of the second section as a whole, and it has been seconded.

A vote being taken, the motion was carried.

John M. Moore: Section 3: "The area and boundaries of Central Conference Jurisdictions may be changed by a majority vote of the General Conference present and voting." I move the adoption of that section.

Edgar Blake: We use the word "Jurisdictions" in connection with Regional Conferences and in connection with these Central Conferences also. It would be necessary to have something more than Jurisdiction or Jurisdictions here to indicate that it is a Central Conference Jurisdiction.

A. F. Watkins: I move that the word "these" be inserted before the words "Central Conference Jurisdictions." Notice in Article VII., Section 1, "There shall also be constituted the following jurisdictions." Now, we say "the area and boundaries of these jurisdictions"—

John M. Moore: What jurisdictions?

A. F. Watkins: The jurisdictions provided for in Article VII., Section 1.

Edgar Blake: The Central Conference areas.

John M. Moore: Then, why not say so?

A. F. Watkins: You should carry in mind the thought that we are laboring under this.

John M. Moore: The report of the committee is this: "The area and boundaries of Central Conference Jurisdictions may be changed by a majority vote of the General Conference present and voting."

A. F. Watkins: "There shall also be constituted the following jurisdictions, each having its own Central Conference"—they are not Central Conference Jurisdictions. Each jurisdiction may have its Central Conference—these jurisdictions for which we have in the first article made provision. We say in Section 3, "The area and boundaries of these jurisdictions may be changed by a majority of the General Conference present and voting." I move that as an amendment.

John M. Moore: I am opposed to that, and I hope it will not be passed.

Frank M. Thomas: While I fully appreciate the position of Dr. Watkins, and he is correct in a sense, yet if this action is taken, as suggested by Dr. Watkins, it will give us trouble.

E. B. Chappell: It will give you trouble anyhow.

A vote being taken, the amendment of Dr. Watkins was lost.

R. E. Jones: It occurs to me that the Regional Conference should not have the absolute right to change a Central Conference without the Central Conference agreeing. These Central Conferences have very small representation in the General Conference, and it is entirely possible that the General Conference could change the boundaries of a Central Conference when the Central Conference would not want it at all. I suggest that we add "with the concurrence of the Central Conference."

Bishop Denny: I second the motion.

John M. Moore: I think that is good, too.

Edgar Blake: Under the powers of the General Conference, Section 2, Article VI., we have provided, as you will see by referring to it, that the General Conference shall not take away any territory from a Regional Conference save with the concurrence of the two. It would seem we ought not to make the power of the Central Conference any more restrictive than with the Regional Conference.

David G. Downey: Then put in the same provision as to this.

John M. Moore: I was going to suggest the same provision in the other when we come to it.

R. E. Jones: The Regional Conferences are protected in the General Conference by a larger vote than the Central Conferences. The Regional Conferences have considerable influence and weight in the General Conference and they can call for a vote and certain propositions may not go through unless agreed to by a certain number of Regional Conferences. But this puts the Central Conference entirely within the grasp of the General Conference.

A. F. Watkins: The article will read, "The areas and boundaries of Central Conference Jurisdictions may be changed by a majority vote of the General Conference present and voting, with the concurrence of the Central Conference Jurisdiction." This thing of making the General Conference subsidiary to a Central Conference does not appear to me to be good constitutional work. It should be the other way.

R. E. Jones: The General Conference is generally right and just, but I don't want to trust it always. It may sometimes make a mistake. I would give the power of making change to the Central Conference and give the approval to the General Conference.

Bishop Mouzon: But suppose that that change affects the boundary of another Central Conference?

Edgar Blake: I do not believe we are doing the wise thing in giving to a Regional Conference the power to prevent a re-

adjustment when it is apparent to everybody that it should be done. Take Europe, for instance; no one knows what readjustment will have to be made there. It is quite possible that a certain group of Conferences in Europe, which might have a majority of the Central Conferences, might prevent the General Conference from making changes required by the minority and greatly necessary. I think we should make provisions that the General Conference, with the concurrence of two successive General Conferences, shall have the power to do just exactly as in the case of Regional Conferences. I do not believe in giving the Central Conferences any more power than we have given the Regional Conferences. I understand Brother Jones does not object to that. I move that the article be amended so as to provide as we have in Section 2, paragraph 2, giving to the General Conference the power to divide, consolidate, and change the Central Jurisdictional boundaries, but that it shall not take away territory from any Central Jurisdiction without the concurrence of two successive General Conferences.

Bishop Denny: The larger amount of local control that can be given with safety, the better for the proposed Church; and if we have adopted something in connection with the home Conferences that is not in harmony with what we propose now, we had better change that than to make this conform to something of that kind. You possibly could get two successive General Conferences to agree to a thing that might be very agreeable to a Central Conference or to a Regional Conference, and the General Conference ought not to be allowed to override a matter of that kind. I do not care which you give the precedence to in this matter. I think it is a matter simply of the order of words and it does not amount to so much just here, but I believe the motion made by Dr. Jones is a valuable principle of local self-government and ought to be preserved, and it ought not to be given to the General Conference to override the will of a Central Conference in a matter of this kind.

J. H. Reynolds: I move as a substitute for the amendment pending, as I understand, that is, that the General Conference with the concurrence of the Central Conference may alter the boundary—I move as a substitute for that that it read that the Central Conference, with the concurrence of the General Conference, may alter the boundaries of a Central Conference.

The motion was seconded.

Rolla V. Watt: I feel a great deal of sympathy with Brother Jones's suggestion, but at the same time, in nearly all these Conferences we are dealing with now, there are different conditions. Now, take Latin America and Porto Rico and Cuba and Mexico and Central and South America—there might be the very best

possible argument why you should want to take Porto Rico out of that combination and attach it to the mainland, and yet Latin America might defeat you there because they didn't want their numbers reduced. That had better be determined by the General Conference. I do not believe a General Conference is going to do an injustice to those people, especially if you have a second vote after four years' intermission. I think that would make it absolutely safe.

C. M. Bishop: I wish to suggest as against the amendment of Dr. Reynolds that it is not likely that the question of boundary in the real significance of the question as to the welfare should always arise in the Central Conferences themselves. This division that is being made in the Central Conferences seems to be in order that there may be the wisest administration of the whole work of the Church, viewed from the standpoint of the chief controlling body of the Church. The local matters might appeal to the Central Conferences affecting their attitude toward boundaries of Conferences, but the larger wisdom of the General Conference is that it should be first consulted as to the administration work in these various jurisdictions. Moreover certain questions of local jealousy on the other hand, of jurisdictional ambition, might enter into that question and there would very likely be conflicts between the contiguous jurisdictions if one jurisdiction initiated a movement to enlarge its boundaries at the expense of another jurisdiction. Of course, there would be trouble on the other hand. Even if you grant to the smaller jurisdiction the right to take action at all concerning this matter, the final determination of it should be with the General Conference, because the rights of more than one jurisdiction are likely to be involved, so I favor it standing as it is.

Albert J. Nast: I am in favor of this action just as originally given to us without any amendment either the one way or the other. Dr. Blake has called our attention to one concrete example and why it will not work well. Now, as to Europe, we all know that this Central Jurisdiction of Europe will be composed of various nations and countries that are now more or less at war with each other.

Bishop McDowell: "More or less" is good.

Albert J. Nast: Some being neutral or trying to be. I am just as sure as anybody can be, who is not a prophet, that at the next General Conference of our Church, if, please God, the war is ended by that time, the delegates from Germany and Switzerland and Sweden and Norway and Denmark and Russia and Finland and Italy and France and North Africa will be perfectly amazed to find that this Commission put them all in one jurisdiction. I think we might trust to the wisdom of the Gen-

eral Conference to adapt itself to the situation, change the boundaries of those jurisdictions and perhaps create two or possibly three out of them. I am in favor of this, just as it stands.

J. H. Reynolds: In further support of my motion I would say, in the first place, it lodges the initiative with the people who know most about the question of altering boundaries. In the second place, putting it there will probably stimulate some sense of responsibility and may help to develop the people. I would also say that we have already placed, at least in the hands of one of these jurisdictions, much larger powers—the power to elect their bishop, the power of local legislation, and action on so many matters of vital concern. I submit finally that it is safe because it places in the hands of the General Conference the power to check any modification of boundaries. It has been suggested that we have the situation in Europe. I submit that Europe is quite abnormal, and we shall have to deal gently with her for many years. I doubt whether throwing them all into one Conference at this time will really accomplish anything for years to come.

Edgar Blake: I think there is one difficulty in allowing the matter to stand just as it is and that is making the General Conference the sole power or authority in these matters. We know how it happens in our own General Conference, and I assume it happens or may happen in the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Somebody comes here from a foreign field and makes a rousing speech on the floor of the General Conference, and then he gets anything that he wants for his particular field.

A. J. Lamar: And we are also men of like feeling.

Edgar Blake: I can see the possibility of two or three delegates coming to the General Conference, say, from Latin America or from Europe and putting up a plea for something. The great majority of the members know nothing of the situation. They have to take the word of these men. What is the result? They vote for what the two or three men ask for, and when it is all done and too late to correct any mistake made the people of the jurisdiction affected discover it has been done, and they have not had a word to say. That is not good for them and not good for the Church. I believe that the Central Conference ought to have something to say in this, but I don't think the Central Conference should have the power to stop the will of the Church as represented by the General Conference and, therefore, I think the provision we have already made touching Regional Conferences is the one that should be put in here, and I move as a substitute for all that is before us that the following be inserted in Section 3: "The area and boundaries of Central Con-

ference Jurisdictions may be changed by the General Conference, the Central Conference Jurisdictions affected agreeing, or it may be changed by the concurrent vote of two successive General Conferences." That is exactly the provision affecting Regional Conferences.

Bishop Mouzon: I am in hearty favor of the substitute just offered by Dr. Blake. It seems to me that those who know most about boundaries should initiate the movement for a change, and not the Central Conferences, but the General Conference shall know most about boundaries. Now, what do I mean? I mean this: I chance to know that there is coming from a certain mission field to the approaching General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, a memorial asking for a change in Conference boundaries, or rather asking for the creation of a new Annual Conference. Now, I somewhat fear that that thing may be done. I know what did happen. I know that a certain Mission came up through its representative and asked that the Mission be erected into an Annual Conference, and they erected the Mission into an Annual Conference, which was a great mistake, and those of us who know something about it have been wishing ever since that it had not been done. This is what I mean: These Central Conferences shall not be the wisest judges of boundaries, but the General Conference will. A concrete case: Suppose that this Latin-American Central Conference should decide that it would be better for Porto Rico and Cuba not to be in that jurisdiction but in the Southeastern Jurisdiction, and suppose that they should so vote; then you would have trouble there, for Cuba and Porto Rico might object and the Southeastern Jurisdiction might object. We are in confusion, and so I heartily favor the substitute which was offered by Dr. Blake.

Bishop McDowell: As protecting local interests and at the same time having the widest outlook upon all the needs of the Church.

A vote being taken, the substitute offered by Dr. Blake was agreed to.

John M. Moore: I now move the adoption of the section as amended.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

John M. Moore: Section 4, "Privileges and Powers":

Subject to the restrictions and limitations of this Constitution and to the rules and regulations adopted by the General Conference in relation to the connexional affairs of the Church, each Central Jurisdictional Conference having not less than 150,000 Church members in full connection shall have authority to legislate regarding the distinctively regional affairs of its area; and to elect from time to time the number of bishops allotted to it by the General Conference; subject, however, to their con-

firmation by the General Conference and to their consecration by the general superintendents. The powers and privileges of each Central Jurisdictional Conference having less than 150,000 Church members in full connection shall be determined by the General Conference.

John F. Goucher: I move that instead of 150,000, occurring in two places, we write 100,000.

The motion was seconded.

John F. Goucher: I see a discrimination, unfortunate and unintended doubtless, because the Latin-American Central Conference has but 32,000 members, the Eastern Asia has 65,000 in full connection, Southern Asia 59,600, but a tremendous probation list, so much so that the Eastern Asia has 45,000 probation list and Southern Asia a 142,000 probation list, making about 112,000 in the Eastern Asia Central Conference, and 202,000, including probationers, in the Southern Asia Central Conference. Now, the Japan Methodist Church has 15,364 members and probationers together. Korea has 18,000. It would seem unfortunate that we cannot make an arrangement by which these larger numbers shall be given one distinctive feature in electing their bishops. Japan has made no mistake. She has exercised that privilege twice. Korea would not make any mistake and China would be greatly helped and so would Southern India. We must recognize another fact—namely, that there is a tremendous movement toward autonomous existence in China since the republican spirit has found lodgment and interpretation in that proposed Republic, and there is a widespread interest and purpose to have an independent Church in China. In 1907 I attended the Centennial Conference in China. There was a meeting called of representatives of all the Methodists in the country at that conference, and that meeting was repeated a few days later in which there were many speeches made and a committee appointed to see what could be done to draw Methodism together for a united Church. From that time to this there has been no interruption in their purpose and no cessation in their efforts.

John M. Moore: I move to extend the time until six o'clock.

The motion being seconded and a vote being taken, the time was extended to six o'clock.

Bishop Mouzon: I move that when we adjourn we adjourn to meet at eight o'clock this evening.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I object. We want to hold meetings of our Commissions to-night on several of these questions, and you will make no time by a night session.

Bishop Mouzon: I withdraw the motion then.

John F. Goucher: I think we will anticipate and avoid a good deal of trouble if we make this 100,000 instead of 150,000.

Edgar Blake: As one who was originally in favor of 150,000, but who gets new light from what Dr. Goucher has said, and from information elsewhere, I second the motion to fix those numbers at 100,000.

Rolla V. Watt: I dislike very much indeed to object to anything with reference to a motion which Dr. Goucher makes, because he has made an exhaustive study of the subject, but I cannot feel that it is a good thing to put into the hands of such small groups the election of their bishops. It seems to me we are throwing the apple of discord into all missionary fields when they reach 100,000 members, generally immature, to permit them to elect their own bishops.

Bishop Leete: I dislike also to object to this, and yet I think we ought to see just exactly what it is that we are doing if we change these figures to 100,000. We are putting it within the possibility of one of the foreign jurisdictions coming into full recognition of its status, and it seems a little hazardous. I defer to the opinion of my brethren if they are in the majority. But I am not satisfied. It does not look right to me. I feel that to give this immature and small number all these powers is rather an experiment. I think 150,000 and a little more time is safer.

R. E. Blackwell: That is not a homogeneous group. You have China and Korea and the Philippine Islands and Malaysia, and they are not at all homogeneous. If they were all homogeneous, it would be different, but I think we had better let it stay where it is.

John F. Goucher: They have had a Central Conference for several years exercising largely the privileges provided for here, and they would be seriously embarrassed if we withdrew from them what they have been exercising.

Albert J. Nast: The chief objection seems to be the giving of authority to elect bishops, but that is guarded. It says to elect the number of bishops allotted to it by the General Conference, so I do not see that there is any particular danger in fixing the number at 100,000, when that is guarded in that way.

Edwin M. Randall: Do we not give the General Conference the power to grant to any Central Conference where the membership is less than 150,000 what functions the General Conference may see fit? That provides for their functioning as they do at the present, and for allowing them autonomy and self-government as seems best. We must remember that these people have only recently been converted, that they have only recently come out of heathenism, and, as has been said, they are rather heterogeneous.

John M. Moore: Suppose they were to become ready before

they reach 150,000, you still have the constitutional authority to let them be put in a Central Conference.

John F. Goucher: I think it should be in the Constitution.

E. B. Chappell: I do not think it is a constitutional requirement. The General Conference may grant it power to elect its bishops whenever the General Conference thinks it is wise to do so.

A vote being taken, the amendment of Dr. Goucher was lost.

John M. Moore: I move the adoption of the paragraph.

R. E. Jones: There is an amendment or two I think that ought to be put into this paragraph. For instance, nothing was said about fixing the boundaries of the Annual Conferences. The Central Conferences may be fixed by the General Conference, but in my mind there is a good reason why the Central Conferences should fix the boundaries of the Annual Conferences. I know that in the distinctively colored Churches it has been found best for the work to have small Annual Conferences, while in our Church in the North we have Annual Conferences with several thousand members, such as Northeast Ohio. I think it would not hurt at all if the Central Conferences are given the right to fix the boundaries of the Annual Conferences. Further, it is suggested that the bishops shall be confirmed by the General Conference, but by what sort of a vote? I should prefer some sort of a provision, such as "unless rejected by a two-thirds vote of the General Conference." A man might be elected that you would not want. That is not only possible, but very probable, and a man might be very unacceptable to us, and unless something was very wrong we should have that man; so I would want the bishops consecrated by the General Conference unless rejected by a two-thirds' vote. Further, it is entirely possible that when the Central Conferences are constructed we shall be wanting to do things here and there. There is only one hospital in our entire Southland. We might want a hospital, and I would want a provision that we should have the power to own and control educational and charitable institutions not controlled otherwise by the Church. That would not interfere with the Freedmen's Aid Society's being operated as it is, but it would give us power and authority to construct such institutions as would permit development among us; but the first thing is, we should have power to fix the boundaries of Missions and Mission Conferences.

John M. Moore: That is already covered. It says they shall legislate with regard to distinctively regional affairs.

R. E. Jones: It might be inferred that we have not that power.

John M. Moore: It could not be.

R. E. Jones: The question would come up and would have to be passed on by the Judicial Council.

E. B. Chappell: Where would you put that in?

Bishop Denny: I am perfectly willing and agreeable. It is entirely in line with all the promptings I have, but there is just this one fear that I have there. There is the old legal maxim, *Expressio unius exclusio alterius*. When you mention the one thing, you exclude the other. I want you to have this, but I fear if you mention this here the special mention of it may shut you off from doing something which you have under your general grant of power.

R. E. Jones: This is specified with reference to the Regional Conference, and that leads me to that, but I am sure we ought to have with reference to the bishops a definite statement as to the vote by which they should be elected.

David G. Downey: Dr. Chappell was asking where it would go in. Each Regional Conference should have full legislative power within its area, including the power to fix boundaries of the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions, and to provide for the organization for the same, provided that no new Annual Conference shall be organized within the States of the United States with less than 14,000 Church members in full connection therewith. If that provision that Dr. Jones refers to goes in, a similar statement should also go in as to the minimum number of members.

Rolla V. Watt: I move that the wording of the section be referred to Dr. Moore, Dr. Blake, and Dr. Jones to report back to us.

Edgar Blake: We can do it right here. Everybody seems to be agreed that the Central Conference shall have the same powers in its jurisdiction that the Regional Conference has in its. We can substitute for the first part of Section 4 down to the last section just what we find over here. It would read,

Each Central Conference shall have power to elect, from time to time, the number of bishops allotted to it by the General Conference, and said bishops shall be confirmed by the General Conference and ordained by the bishops, unless two-thirds of the members of the General Conference, present and voting, shall object to such confirmation.

Subject to the limitations and restrictions of this Constitution, each Central Conference shall have full legislative power over all distinctively jurisdictional affairs within its area, including the power to fix boundaries for the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions, and to provide for the organization of the same; provided, that no new Annual Conference shall be organized in the States of the United States with less than 14,000 Church members in full connection therewith.

3. Each Central Conference shall also have power to receive, own, transfer, and control educational, benevolent, and charitable institutions within its own territory which are not otherwise legally provided for,

and shall have supervision of all such enterprises except those which are owned, controlled, and supervised by some other organic agency of the Church.

4. Each Central Conference may, in the exercise of the powers provided herein, make rules and regulations not contrary to or in conflict with any rule or regulation made by the General Conference for the government and control of the connectional affairs of the Church.

Rolla V. Watt: That is all right with the exception of the number.

Edgar Blake: Colored is smaller than anything we have now.

Rolla V. Watt: I move that the section as read by Dr. Blake be adopted. I think the only thing he left out that I now recall was in the second line of Section 3, "according to a uniform principle." But we can hardly provide any uniform principle for a Central Conference. I move that as a substitute for that part of Section 4 down to the last sentence in the first paragraph.

R. E. Jones: Except in the matter of the number of lay members in the Annual Conference, that is all right. The reason for making the minimum membership in the Annual Conference is that the Annual Conference shall not be represented in the General Conference by delegates if the Annual Conference does not have as many as 14,000. That is 14,000 minimum membership. With us the ratio is entirely different. It has been mentioned as 2,000, and I would suggest instead of 14,000 that you make it 5,000, and that will give us a small enough Annual Conference.

Edgar Blake: I question whether we want our Colored Conferences to be splitting up their Conferences, making two out of one. I don't think we ought to reduce the ratio below 14,000.

R. E. Jones: There is another difference. I don't know whether it is convenient for administration or not, but it obtains all through the distinctively colored Churches, and the reason for that is that they must go into the small towns with the Annual Conferences, and it is very hard to provide entertainment. At some places where we should go we cannot go because the entertainment is very limited. I think it would be entirely wise to fix the number at 5,000.

Edgar Blake: I don't see the force of that.

John M. Moore: I think it might be reduced, but I hardly think as low as 5,000, but I do think we could go to 10,000 or 8,000.

R. E. Jones: I will take that. That would take in all the Conferences we have now.

Bishop McDowell: This provides for the organization of new ones that do not disturb any of the boundaries that now exist. It only provides that new Conferences shall not be organized

with fewer than 14,000. The Conferences that at present have less than 14,000 are not disturbed.

John M. Moore: I move that we make it 10,000.

Edgar Blake: I do not see the necessity of changing that. There is one Conference, a Mission Conference, that has less than 5,000. Several have less than 10,000. Eight have less than 14,000, and 14 that have less than 20,000, and 17 that have less than 30,000, and 19 that have less than 50,000.

Bishop Leete: I know what Dr. Jones is driving at, and I know it from experience in handling those bodies. There is competition between the African Churches, the Colored Methodist Episcopal Churches, and our own Methodist Episcopal Churches on that very point. There are several things to be said. One is the matter of economy. These Conferences sometimes cover large sections of territory and it is awfully hard for the men to pay railroad expenses to get them to the point of meeting of the Conference. They have to hold sessions in little towns, and if they have the Conference too large it makes it burdensome to entertain them. Then, again, the Conference means a great deal to those people, and the more places they have the Conference in the stronger their work and the more they are able to advertise their principal men and get matters before the people whom they want to reach. From what I know by experience, Dr. Jones is speaking of a matter which he is competent to bring to us, and I do not think we risk anything to let those people have smaller Conferences. We are really contributing to the going forward of their work.

Edgar Blake: Is 10,000 acceptable, Dr. Jones?

R. E. Jones: All right.

Edgar Blake: I move that we substitute 10,000, then.

E. B. Chappell: Has Dr. Blake incorporated in his amendment the proviso about the 150,000 members in full connection?

Edgar Blake: No, sir; that sentence is not affected. The paragraph I am reading is offered as a substitute for all of Section 4 that is embraced in the first paragraph down to the sentence ending "by the general superintendent."

E. B. Chappell: That does not make provision for electing bishops.

John M. Moore: Yes, it does. If you will let the committee have that, they will put it in form and let you have it in the morning.

David G. Downey: There is another little item which I want to invite attention to. I think there is no necessity of putting in there the words "of the General Conference present and voting." I think we could leave out the words "present and voting." Two-

thirds of the General Conference, I think, is sufficient, because the General Conference has a quorum that is fixed.

Rolla V Watt: I renew my motion that this matter be referred to Dr. Moore, Dr. Blake, and Dr. Jones to be whipped into shape for consideration to-morrow morning the first item.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

A. J. Lamar: I have a resolution which I would present for adoption now if it excites no discussion or opposition. I shall read it, and if it excites any discussion or opposition I will introduce it to-morrow morning:

Whereas it is very desirable that the members of the General Conference and our people of both Churches should have full information of what has been done and what has been proposed to be done by this Commission; therefore be it

Resolved, That the two Chairmen and two Secretaries of this Commission be appointed a committee to formulate a document which shall present clearly every point upon which this Commission has agreed at its three meetings, and all such parts of the proceedings of this Commission which have been debated but neither approved nor disapproved by the Commission as they may deem sufficiently important to be reported.

Resolved, That the committee do the work at the earliest practicable moment so as to publish the statement not later than the 15th of March, 1918.

This is signed by Charles M. Stuart, M. L. Walton, Frank Neff, and myself.

E. C. Reeves: Just put my name to that, too.

A. J. Lamar: And I may say that this has been introduced at the request of other members, too.

Abram W Harris: Withhold that until to-morrow morning.

A. J. Lamar: I have no objection to withholding it, provided I am not put out of the way by the order of the day.

John M. Moore: We are ready to proceed to paragraph 2, but if it is the will of the Commission we can adjourn.

Rolla V Watt: We cannot do anything else. Why not dispose of Dr. Lamar's motion?

Edwin M. Randall: We have a report from the Committee on General Reference that we could consume time on.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The business strictly would be the matter presented by Dr. Lamar. Shall we consider that at this time?

E. B. Chappell: I move that discussion on that be deferred until to-morrow morning.

The motion was seconded.

David G. Downey: If you do that, we are likely to have the same result that we had at Traverse City: everything crowded up to the end and rushed through. Complaints have been made of unauthorized reports, and here is a provision for an author-

ized report; it simply designates the persons who are to make that authorized report and calls on them to do the work so that it can get into the hands of those concerned with it by the 15th of March. I can speak on it, because I am not one of the brethren involved.

Bishop McDowell: You are likely to be.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The paper of Dr. Lamar is in the possession of the House. What is desired to be done with it?

Bishop Leete: I want to move an amendment.

E. B. Chappell: I moved, and the motion was seconded, that action be deferred until to-morrow morning.

Bishop Leete: I seconded that myself, so I cannot go against it; but the Commission is now adjourned by limitation of time.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): There was a motion to extend the time. Apparently it is not desired to postpone this matter—

A. J. Lamar: In view of the fact that this amendment will probably provoke some discussion, I have no objection in the world to withdrawing it now if I can have any arrangement by which I can get the floor with it in the morning.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): The time was extended and this paper is before us and Bishop Leete desires to offer an amendment.

Bishop Leete: Brother Lamar may accept what I propose. I want to add to it one more member from each Commission.

A. J. Lamar: I consent to that.

Bishop Mouzon: I am heartily in favor of publishing the report as indicated just as soon as it can possibly be done. I think considerable harm has been done already by unauthorized statements being given to the press. However, I am not quite prepared to vote for Dr. Lamar's resolution. It may be that the method he proposes is the best possible method. It is conceivable that there may be a better way. It may be that the brethren named are the very men who ought to do it, but it may be that there are other men who ought to do it. Then I can easily see that many of these reports must go to a committee to be revised and put in proper shape before given to the press, and I can vote with a great deal more ease and confidence if this matter can be put off until some of us can think about it a little more. Maybe we can do it in some better way.

A. J. Lamar: I do not see how it can be done any better than by the two Chairmen and the two Secretaries. I will accept Bishop Leete's amendment to add one member more from each Commission.

Bishop Cranston: I do not suppose any of the members re-

ferred to in the resolution would be accused of a desire to shirk any work. But I do insist that that is not the best committee that can be constituted for the purpose indicated. First, because Bishop Candler is ill. Bishop Denny has been substituted for him, but he has to leave for Mexico. Bishop Cranston is not so well fitted for that work as a number of others who could be named. My own judgment is that that committee ought to be more carefully chosen. This possibly is intended as a compliment to the two Chairmen. I would suggest that the two Secretaries be on the committee, and then Dr. Blake and Dr. Moore almost as a matter of course, and I think that would be a committee that would do the work satisfactorily; but I beg not to be included in that duty, because I am really not in shape to go about that work just now.

A. J. Lamar: Would it not meet your approval that you be given the right to appoint somebody to act in your stead?

Bishop Cranston: That would not be the same as if the person that I should name had been originally appointed on the committee. He would feel a delicacy in performing that duty.

Bishop Mouzon: I was just thinking of what Bishop Cranston said. It would be putting a considerable task on Bishop Candler. Bishop Candler has not been present at many of these meetings, and Bishop Denny, who has been acting for him as Chairman, is going away. Probably a little larger committee might be desirable.

Bishop Denny: It is simply a question of reporting facts. The committee doesn't have to do anything but report facts.

Edgar Blake: There is more involved than simply reporting facts. If we reach a final agreement upon a plan for the reorganization of the two Churches, it will be our duty to submit our agreement in a constitutional form, and it would therefore appear to be very necessary that we should appoint a committee here to take those reports and do work of editorial revision upon them in order to put the language into proper shape for constitutional action. I think there should be represented on that committee certain members of the Committee on Judicial Council that prepared that report and also members of the Committee on the Status of the Negro and members of the Committee on Conferences. I think that committee should be selected with very great care. Of course, the Secretaries should be on it—we couldn't get along without them—and I think perhaps Bishop Candler and Bishop Cranston should be on the committee so that their names would be signed to the report, although they should not be expected to do any of the work. I think the committee should be selected with a great deal more care

than is contemplated in the resolution of Dr. Lamar, and I wish we could have more time to consider it.

C. M. Bishop: I move that the Commission adjourn.

The motion was seconded, put to a vote, was carried, and the Commission was dismissed with benediction by Bishop Cranston.

TWELFTH DAY, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1918.

MORNING SESSION.

The Joint Commission met pursuant to adjournment and was called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Denny.

Dr. R. E. Blackwell conducted the devotional exercises.

The hymn, "Faith of Our Fathers," was sung.

The eleventh chapter of Hebrews was read.

Prayer was offered by Dr. Blackwell.

The hymn, "The Son of God goes forth to war," was sung.

Prayer was offered by Dr. Goucher.

The minutes of the last session were read, corrected, and approved.

The roll was called and the following were present: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke, Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon. Ministers: Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. J. Wallace, C. M. Stuart, F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar. Laymen: G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock, H. N. Snyder, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves.

J. H. Reynolds: Judge Walton left with me a message for all the Commission. He had to leave yesterday afternoon. We were in the midst of a discussion and he did not want to disturb the meeting. His son is in the army and has just received orders to report at a distant camp preparatory to going to France. Judge Walton only had time to go to see his son before he starts on his journey. He therefore felt that he must go. He stayed until the last minute. He instructed me to say that he was leaving his vote with Dr. Moore. I move that leave of absence be granted him and that his request to leave his vote with Dr. Moore be granted.

The request was granted.

J. H. Reynolds: I might add in this connection that Dr. Snyder is expected to be here by ten o'clock.

Bishop Mouzon: What is the parliamentary situation just now?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny) : A continuation of the discussion of the report of the Committee on Associate Regional Conferences, which we have since changed to Central Conferences.

Bishop Mouzon : I was under the impression that Dr. Lamar's resolution was before us and that we adjourned while we were considering that.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny) : I believe you are correct.

Bishop Mouzon : I move to amend the resolution offered by Dr. Lamar by adding the names of Dr. Blake and Dr. Moore as members of the committee.

Rolla V. Watt : Would it not be wise to prepare for the substitution of two men for Bishop Cranston in our case and Bishop Denny in your case?

Bishop Mouzon : The report will have to be signed by the Chairmen, and the Chairmen should remain on the committee. Bishop Candler has been sick and not present to any great extent, Bishop Denny will soon have to go to Mexico, and Bishop Cranston is none too robust. But, although the two Chairmen may not be in position to do very much work, we certainly can feel that, with the two Secretaries and Dr. Blake and Dr. Moore, there is no question about the matter being properly attended to.

A. J. Lamar : Bishop Mouzon has mentioned my reason for suggesting this committee. The two Chairmen must of necessity sign the report. This is just a statement of facts. It is work that the Secretaries alone can properly do, and I did not expect Bishop Cranston and Bishop Candler to do any great amount of work in the formulation of that report when I made my motion. But I think it is due to the Chairmen of the two Commissions that they should be on the committee, leaving out of sight the fact that they must necessarily sign the report, if it is to go to our General Conferences and to our people officially. That was my reason for naming the committee I did. I have no objection in the world to adding one man from each of the two Commissions to this committee if it is desired. I think the Secretaries are thoroughly familiar with the work we have given them to do, and as a rule the larger your committee the poorer the work that comes out of it, and the smaller the committee, if competent, the better for clearness of report. I will not oppose it if you want to put them on, but it seems to me it simply adds to the expense and does not add anything to efficiency.

Frank M. Thomas : I wish to support Bishop Mouzon's amendment. I feel that the Chairmen must be on this committee, and I feel that the Secretaries, who have to do the larger part of the clerical work at least in getting it into shape, ought to have the help of two such competent men as Dr. Blake and Dr. Moore,

who have had so much to do with formulating this report. I believe the committee of six is large enough. We could get together in some central place, like Nashville or Louisville or Chicago, and do this work in a short time. If you want to enlarge it, I would suggest that you add one layman, but no more than that.

Edgar Blake: It is generally understood that while it is advisable and in fact necessary to have the Chairmen of the two Commissions on the committee it is not expected that they are to do any of this work. That would leave simply the two Secretaries and the two men named. Now, there is a very valuable element we are missing. We ought to have two additional men, one from each Commission, to give the editorial supervision to this report. I think it would be very valuable if this committee could have the assistance of a man like Mr. Simpson, and I would like to suggest that we have two additional members on the committee and that Mr. Simpson be one of them. Of course, I don't care to nominate for the other side.

Frank M. Thomas: I would like to name the one for our side—Dr. Hyer.

Edgar Blake: Acting upon the suggestion of Dr. Thomas, with your permission, I would like to include in my amendment the name of Dr. Hyer.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Without objection that may be done, and the amendment is now before you.

A. J. Lamar: I hope we shall stand by the original resolution. You are making the committee too big, entirely too big. There are different shades of opinion, and if brethren are going to send in elaborate reports with a consideration of news, which I hope not, things are likely to get mixed. Dr. Hyer is my friend. Dr. Moore is recognized as a very good man, but neither of those brethren represents my views. I am not an extremist. We have in our Commission, as you have in yours, I doubt not, two extreme opinions. Then we have a mean, and I believe I belong to the mean.

David G. Downey: Do not the terms of making the report render it impossible for any man to color it by his opinion? I understand what the brethren have to give out is not their opinion, but the facts. Therefore, the fears expressed by Dr. Lamar really will have no foundation. These brethren are not put on the committee to put their own views into anything, but simply to help in getting up an exact statement of the situation.

W. N. Ainsworth: I perceive that the functions of this committee are about to be enlarged—that is, if we are to go by the talks here—and it is altogether likely that it will be desirable to

enlarge its functions a little bit. Before we get through this meeting we shall have committed to the same committee a little revision of language. We may have to commit with authority to act concerning a lot of details that we have not been able to settle before we leave here. It occurs to me that we had better settle those matters before we leave.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I appreciate very much what Dr. Blake has said; but if it means that this committee shall meet and spend any considerable time, I have set apart for other purposes, as far as we can, all the time after the adjournment of this Commission with the meeting of your Conference in May. Beyond that I certainly cannot go. Being reasonably active at home, with an office force of fourteen aside from myself, seven of whom are "somewhere in France," I do not know how my hands could be fuller. I have given all the time that I have been able, too, and was glad to give it; and I will give it in any way that I possibly can give it, but if this means that I have to attend the meetings of the committee, I cannot do it.

A. J. Lamar: Ought not this work to be done here, now? It is important that it should be done at the earliest possible moment in order that the people may have the result of our labors and have time to think over them before the meeting of the General Conference which is held in May. And this committee in my judgment, for that reason and also for reasons of economy, should go into its work as soon as the Commission adjourns and do that work here and now in Savannah.

Bishop Mouzon: I was going to move to amend Dr. Lamar's resolution, but I again heartily agree with him, and I now move the previous question.

The motion was seconded.

John F. Goucher: I had desired to say a word or two.

Bishop Mouzon: I withdraw the motion.

John F. Goucher: I suggest that this be done by the 15th of March. I think it should be completed as early as possible, and I therefore think it should be begun at the earliest possible moment.

A. J. Lamar: I move the previous question.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The first vote will be on the amendment, which is to add the names of Dr. Moore and Dr. Blake.

A further vote being taken, the names of Dr. Hyer and Mr. Simpson were added.

A further vote being taken, the resolution was agreed to.

So the committee consisted of the two Chairmen, the two Secretaries, Dr. Blake, Dr. Moore, Mr. Simpson, and Dr. Hyer.

E. B. Chappell: Now, I would like to make an inquiry. Is

the report that these gentlemen are to send out to be limited as this motion indicates? That is, are they to select such parts as they see fit of those matters upon which we have agreed and also of those upon which we have failed to take action? Suppose there are points upon which we disagree. Are we going to keep silent about those or shall a report be made on these also, and shall it indicate just wherein we disagree? It seems to me that this resolution ought to be fuller.

A. J. Lamar: This resolution was written here on the table, and of course may be imperfect. The intention in my mind when I wrote it was this: That that committee should report under three heads: (1) The vital points—the important points on which the Commission has agreed and which it recommends. (2) The points which were proposed and debated and on which the Commission did not agree and took no action because of their failure to agree. (3) Any important points upon which the Commission failed to agree because of want of time.

Bishop McDowell: Is it not probably true that a good many tentative approvals that we have given to various measures have been given in view of the revision of those measures in the light of what we may have come to as we go on?

A. J. Lamar: I think that is certainly true.

Bishop McDowell: Therefore, would it not be very difficult to make any very large list of things to which we had permanently agreed?

A. J. Lamar: I think that is so.

Bishop McDowell: Would it not be wise, therefore, probably, to report to the General Conference those matters which we have tentatively consented to and that there are a number of matters still before us, reporting them all not as matters that we had formally adopted, but as the result of our explorations and endeavors?

A. J. Lamar: Those are my views. In the sense of finality we haven't adopted anything. We cannot do it. We want to report to our General Conferences what we have done and let them deal with these matters in such a way as they see fit, either by continuation of this Commission or the appointment of another Commission or by direct action.

Bishop Mouzon: If I understand Bishop McDowell, and if I understand what Dr. Lamar has said by way of giving assent, I am not at all in sympathy with what those two gentlemen propose. After all we have done, it is too late now to suggest that we present to the Church a report saying we have done nothing and leaving everything in doubt. I have been insisting from the very first meeting of the Commission that we nail something down and let it stay nailed down, and I believe the very first

thing that should be reported is what we have agreed to—the things that the Joint Commission has discussed and touching which we have come to definite conclusions. Let that go before the Church, and then the things indicated by Dr. Lamar in his first very clear statement, but, brethren, by no means at this late hour in the sessions of this Commission let us make any remark or take any action that would indicate that we have failed definitely to nail anything down.

John M. Moore: As I understand it, there is nothing before the house.

The Chairman (Bishop Cranston): Dr. Lamar's motion is still before the house.

John M. Moore: We are talking about things that ought to be talked about to-morrow and not to-day. Let us see what we can do now, and after we have gone to the end of our labors then let us see what we can do.

W. N. Ainsworth: I agree with Dr. Moore: I think we all want to provide for an adequate statement to be made to the Churches at the conclusion of this meeting as to what we have done, but we may have done a good deal more than we have done now, before we go away. I think we ought to stay here until we have perfected a plan to be handed up to the General Conference and we trust by them to be passed down to the Annual Conferences, and I wish to move, therefore, while being in perfect agreement with all that Dr. Lamar wants done, that his resolution be laid on the table, not to kill it, but to have it there when we are ready to act on it.

A. J. Lamar: I am perfectly willing to withdraw this resolution and present it again to-morrow afternoon. If any member has a better resolution, I am willing to withdraw it permanently.

W. N. Ainsworth: We want to act on it, but at a later date.

John F. Goucher: I rise to a point of order.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The Doctör will please state his point of order.

John F. Goucher: The point of order is that the resolution, having been amended, cannot be withdrawn by Dr. Lamar; and if Dr. Ainsworth will accept my suggestion he will simply move that further consideration be postponed until to-morrow afternoon.

W. N. Ainsworth: Suppose we adjourn before then. What objection is there to putting it on the table until we are ready to take it up? I made the statement that my motion was not made with any idea that it should be laid on the table to kill it, but that we just desired by that means to postpone it until we were ready to take it up.

Bishop Mouzon: There is a serious objection to laying this resolution on the table.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): My own idea is this: That unless a Commissioner has the floor he cannot make a motion, and it also takes the getting of the floor to second a motion. I know our common practice is otherwise. I recognized Bishop Mouzon, not knowing whether he was going to second the motion or not. I heard calls from the floor, "I second it." If this is regarded as a second, discussion is cut off. You cannot discuss a motion to lay on the table.

Bishop Mouzon: Dr. Ainsworth interpreted his motion to mean a postponement, which is not a motion to lay on the table.

Bishop Denny: Bishop Mouzon is too good a presiding officer to think that a man can make a motion in language, and then interpret it to mean something else.

A vote being taken, the motion to lay on the table was lost.

Bishop Mouzon: Now, I move the previous question.

The motion was seconded by Rev C. M. Bishop and, being put to a vote, was carried.

A vote being taken, Dr. Lamar's motion was carried.

Frank M. Thomas: A question of information: I think it is highly important at this stage that the revised report of the Committee on Other Conferences be at least placed in the hands of the Commission.

Bishop Mouzon: Is it ready?

Frank M. Thomas: It ought to be. We have only a day and a night left, and it should be in the hands of the brethren.

Bishop McDowell: I shall ask Dr. Blake to make a statement about that report.

Edgar Blake: The Subcommittee of Four made a report to the Committee on Conferences and that report is in printed form. Part of it has been acted upon by the whole committee. There are four additional items that have not been acted upon by the whole committee. I think it would be quite proper and wise to take this printed report and distribute it among the members of this Joint Commission and let those parts that have been acted upon by the subcommittee, but not considered as yet by the whole committee, come directly to the Commission without action by the Committee on Conferences. We are ready to distribute those acted upon now, if it is desired.

Rolla V. Watt: Let that be done at the close of this session. We are on another matter now.

Frank M. Thomas: Treating Mr. Watt's suggestion as a motion, I second it.

A vote being taken, the motion of Mr. Watt was carried.

John M. Moore: Dr. Blake will now report for our subcommittee.

Edgar Blake: Your Committee appointed to bring in an amendment to the first paragraph of Section 4, under "Central Conferences," recommend as follows:

Shall have power to elect from time to time the number of bishops allotted to it by the General Conference, and said bishops shall be confirmed by the General Conference and ordained by the bishops, unless two-thirds of the members of the General Conference, present and voting, shall object to said confirmation.

Frank M. Thomas: Why that change from what we first have?

John M. Moore: To make it more specific.

Edgar Blake: A request was made by Dr. Jones yesterday that the powers of the Central Conferences be made specific. Your committee understood that that should be done and that is what has been done.

John F. Goucher: This is a very elaborate substitution. If it is here in print, I cannot see why it cannot be distributed, so that we can cast our eyes upon it.

Edgar Blake: What we have read has already been agreed to by the General Committee for Regional Conferences. In other words, we simply confer upon the Central Conferences the exact powers which the Regional Conferences are given. That is all.

E. B. Chappell: Let me make an inquiry of Dr. Blake: You speak of Regional Conferences. Ought not "Jurisdictional" be put in there?

Edgar Blake: Yes, that is very satisfactory.

Frank M. Thomas: In other words, as I understand it, the only difference in the status of these two Conferences is in name. The representation in the General Conference is the same, their bishops are the same, and have the same standing in the General Conference as the bishops of the Regional Conferences, and elected in the same way. Is that true?

Edgar Blake: The provision is exactly the same. The language is identical except that in two instances you provide in the Regional Conferences that the Regional Conferences shall have power to elect from time to time the number of bishops allotted to them according to a uniform rule. That "according to a uniform rule" has been omitted, because it was thought conditions were not exactly the same and the General Conference acts on each according to merits; then we substituted, according to the action of this body yesterday, 10,000 instead of 14,000. Your committee simply carried out the wishes of the Joint Commission as expressed yesterday.

John M. Moore: I move the adoption.

The motion was seconded.

Frank M. Thomas: I will not say that I am opposed to the change yet. I think we are coming down now to really the biggest question that has been before the two Churches. The question we have been discussing has been a critical question, but it turned on one point. The question now is the relation of the different parts of the new Church, and the matter involves more wisdom than I possess to think through it at this time. You have created larger jurisdictions and minor jurisdictions, and their relation to each other is a gigantic question, and I don't think you can do it with scissors. I think a very fundamental question is involved here and I am in favor of the provision as it originally stood.

John M. Moore: It does not seem to me that it changes the provisions as they originally stood. Originally it said that they should have the power to legislate regarding the distinctively regional affairs of the area. What are they? They are included back here under Regional Conferences; the power to legislate just so that the legislation is not contrary to the constitution of the Church and shall not be opposed to that which is done for the connectional affairs of the Church. There is a very great difference, however, between the Central Conferences and the Regional Conference. The members of the Regional Conference shall be the General Conference. The Central Conference has a very limited representation in the General Conference. In the Regional Conference Jurisdiction the Annual Conferences elect delegates to the General Conference. Under this provision the Annual Conferences do not elect delegates to the General Conference. They elect delegates only to the Central Conference, and then the Central Conference elects a very limited number to the General Conference. When it comes to the bishops, the bishops are to be elected by the Central Conference. They are to have powers in accordance with the Constitution, and, as I understand it, they are to have powers as bishops in that Central Conference only. I do not understand that they are to have powers outside of the Conference. They are to do their work in the Central Conference.

Frank M. Thomas: What is to prevent a bishop from being assigned from one area to another?

John M. Moore: We have a provision in the original draft preventing that. The assignment has to be consented to, and the whole thing is carefully safeguarded. It seems to me that there is a very decided difference, and in making this change we do not change that part at all. If the Commission accepts the draft found in Section 4, certainly then it accepts the draft as arranged by this committee. That is the way it looks to me.

E. B. Chappell: It seems to me that if this were accepted in the case of the Regional Conferences we should define very clearly the relations of the bishops to the entire Church. In the case of this Central Conference we do not. We leave the matter entirely undefined, and I think the matter needs to be made clear.

Bishop Cooke: I think the one thing that must be first cleared up is this: that we are to understand distinctly that the kind and character of the Methodist episcopacy is hereby changed. Is that understood, that the fundamental character and the nature of Methodist episcopacy is hereby changed from an itinerant general superintendency to diocesan episcopacy limited to the jurisdiction from which he comes?

Bishop Mouzon: There is a very important question here, and I think Dr. Thomas does well to call attention to it. We are laboring under the disadvantage of not having the printed report before us. Some of us cannot carry these things in our minds, and I observe that some of the members of the Commission have an advantage now of having the report. It appears that the reports have been in part distributed.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The order was that they should be distributed at the close of the session. Bishop Mouzon has the floor, brethren.

Bishop Mouzon: We wish to inquire as to the status of a bishop to the Central Conference. Does the bishop elected by a Central Conference have the same relation to the Church at large that a bishop elected by a Regional Conference has? I think my question is important, although nobody else seems to think so.

Several: Yes, we do.

*Bishop Mouzon: I raise that question. I want it to get hold of you as it has gotten hold of me. I ask, Does a bishop elected by a Central Conference have the same relation to the Church at large as a bishop elected by a Regional Conference does? If that is what we intend, there are some of us who will stand here all day and object to any such thing as that.

E. B. Chappell: That is exactly the question I raised.

Bishop Mouzon: Bishop Cooke raised the question of whether or not you are making a fundamental change in the character of our episcopacy. We are making fundamental changes in the character of a number of things. I am quite sure that the relation of the missionary bishops to the entire Church is not exactly the same as Bishop Cooke's relation to the Methodist Episcopal Church. If it is understood that a bishop elected by a Central Conference is the bishop of the Central Conference in the sense that his activities as a presiding bishop are to

be confined to that Central Conference, then I stand ready to vote in favor of it; but if this General Conference may take a bishop of a Central Conference and assign him to one of your Regional Conferences, we will never agree on that point at all.

H. M. Du Bose: I have intended to raise this very important question at this juncture. In two committees, but particularly in the Committee of Eight, I called attention to this situation, and as we did not succeed in getting any definite statement there, I gave notice that I would call attention to the twilight zone lying between the Central Conferences and the other Regional Conferences in regard to the episcopacy. I asked the categorical question as to what the relations of this so-called Central Conference would be to the general body. There was no definite answer, but a little byplay to the effect that this matter had been carefully dealt with in the past and it might be dealt with in the future. It was also suggested that the bishops of this Church might be possibly of another race than the Conference itself, all of which did not get into the record, and the difficulty remained. I know we have made certain provisions in the larger plan and in this plan which came from the Committee of Eight; but still they are not such as remove the difficulties in my mind, and that are in the minds of some of my colleagues, as to what the relations of the bishops of these Central Conferences will be to the General Conference. So far as I can apprehend, there is no difference between the bishops elected by the Regional Conferences composing the General Conference and the now so-called Central Conferences. It has already occurred to me that there should be some definition, either by actual ruling or conventional proceeding, that those bishops could be kept from presiding over the General Conference, but there is nothing in the Constitution to prevent this. We might as well be frank. This has been a matter of contention all the time and would become an apple of discord. So that in Christian statesmanship and brotherliness we should understand this matter perfectly, that there be no difficulty in the future. I tried several times to get the floor, but now I can only repeat what Bishop Mouzon has said. It is a matter that should be inquired into and stated definitely.

Rolla V. Watt: The point raised by Bishop Cooke is a good deal broader than that raised by Bishop Mouzon—namely, that we are limiting the episcopacy to regions and depriving them of being general superintendents, traveling throughout the connections. Bishop Cooke did not seek to draw a line between the bishops of the Central Conferences and the bishops of the Regional Conferences, but to point out that we are putting limitations upon the episcopacy, so that they can only move under

certain very limited conditions from one section of the Church to another.

Bishop Leete: I rise to a question of privilege, for the benefit of a member of the body who does not catch all that is being done. Dr. Spencer has a resolution that he wants to present with reference to the general superintendents. I do not know exactly what it is, and he does not know exactly what you are doing; but if this is the time to present that for information he ought to be apprised of it and given a chance.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Is there any objection to hearing Dr. Spencer's paper as a matter of information? I hear none, and the Doctor can proceed.

Claudius B. Spencer: I appreciate that. May I preface it by saying I purpose at the proper time to offer this resolution:

Resolved, That we request and instruct the Committee on Conferences to take into consideration the propriety of so framing their report as to provide that the bishops shall be elected and sent apart as now provided, and that their residential relation and supervision of the Regional Conferences shall be as indicated in that plan; but, nevertheless, to provide that they may preside over such Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions throughout the connection as may be deemed wise by the College of Bishops, and as they shall be assigned to them by the College of Bishops, thus preserving our itinerant general superintendency and the restrictive rule which guarantees and protects the same.

Mr. Chairman, the reason for introducing this resolution is to provide for an inquiry, nothing more nor less, as to whether there may not be some practicable and acceptable provision whereby we may preserve, without any essential limitation whatever, the principle of Regional Conferences and administration and at the same time so function it as to preserve our itinerant general superintendency. I advance four reasons: (1) There is no step this Joint Commission has taken that is so revolutionary that it strikes down our general superintendency. Our connectionalism has until now been visualized in our bishops. Our form of episcopacy has been the symbol of our connectionalism. Can we put anything adequately in its place when that general superintendency is destroyed? Must we not pause and give this question the most prayerful consideration? (2) We are about to need this visualizing of our connectionalism, to need it, in fact, more than ever. If especially in our border communities we can have the visitations of bishops from both the Northern and Southern jurisdictions as occasions may seem to suggest and wisdom may arrange, we shall promote unity, the spirit of the hearty interblending in this transition stage, and indeed until the latest moment of time, more than by any other conceivable instrumentality. The people will say, "Now, are we one? We still have our bishops." Nobody is swallowed up.

Mr. Chairman, we shall need this unifying visualizing. We shall need it to carry over without serious friction and loss our church properties, educational properties, and possible annuities. When I think that more than eighteen million dollars of church property alone, not to speak of millions of dollars, perhaps ten millions, in educational institutions, is in white churches alone in eighteen Annual Conferences and Missions with more than two-thirds of a million members, and is to pass over into the Southern jurisdictions, it occurs to me as most desirable for the success of unification, in fact as well as on paper, that there should be this intermingling. I should think it would be demanded by those who are to take residential or regional charge of these areas. I speak it absolutely without prejudice, without one taint of Pharisaism. I am speaking in behalf of the success of our program. We shall then never hear of this "Rights of Minority," because then, by that provision, all will be passed into one. (3) We need some such arrangement, Mr. Chairman, to make us one—cosmopolitan but united—as we stand in the presence of the nation. Bishop McDowell is at this moment bishop-resident in Washington. The arrangement to which we are giving our indorsement throws him out of Washington, which passes into the jurisdiction of the Southern Regional Conference. Hereafter he can never enter, except in courtesy, the capital of the Republic, and never have an ounce of influence that is backed up by episcopal prerogative. Would it not add to the unity of the nation if the bishop of Boston or Chicago, as well as the Bishop of Richmond or Raleigh, should be occasionally allowed to act as a bishop in the Conference in which Boston is located? In fact, is it not vitally necessary that it should be so? Does unification demand that it be made impossible that a bishop from the North or East or West shall appear as such in the presidency of the Conference of the capital of this our common nation? (4) We would put zest and fire into our Missions. It would show to the world our solidarity, if Bishop Denny should visit Japan, or Lambuth in Africa and Bashford in Eastern Asia should exchange, or Mouzon, who understands Brazil, should again not only visit Brazil, but pass down into Argentina and that world-man Oldham come from the Argentine to Brazil and to Ohio and Illinois or cross to his old field in Malaysia or Hindustan. I do not argue any of these questions, but I do suggest and move that, in accordance with this resolution, the practicability of the matter be referred to the proper committee with the request and instruction that they report to the Joint Commission on the same.

David G. Downey: This is a matter that will come up under

"Powers," and I move that it be referred to the Committee on Conferences to be brought up at the proper time.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edgar Blake: May I call attention to the situation as it appears to be so far as we have gone? If you will turn to page 5, under "Powers of the General Conference," under Section 2, paragraph 5, you will notice it reads:

To define and fix the powers and duties of Subregional Conferences, including their boundaries, and to elect and assign the bishops to the same.

Then go down to paragraph 7, and you will find this: "To define and fix the privileges, powers, and duties of the episcopacy; to fix, according to a uniform principle, the number of bishops to be elected by each of the several Regional Conferences; to confirm their election," etc. There does not appear to be in the Constitution as tentatively agreed upon thus far any discrimination as between the bishops of the Subregional Conferences and the Regional Conferences. Their functions have not been defined as separating one from the other. Now, if it is desired to do that thing—

David G. Downey: A point of order.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): State it.

David G. Downey: My motion was to refer Dr. Spencer's paper to the Committee on Conferences. Is Dr. Blake discussing that? Or does he think that is disposed of?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I understood he was discussing that in a broader way.

• John M. Moore: I rise to a point of order.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): What is your point of order?

John M. Moore: That the paper of Dr. Spencer is not before us, that it was only read for information.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The point of order is not well taken, because the resolution of Dr. Spencer does relate to what is before us, and Dr. Downey moved to refer it to the proper committee—

John M. Moore: Was not that read for information?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Yes, but it is within the power of any member of the Commission to take the information that is pertinent to the matter under discussion and refer it to its proper committee.

E. B. Chappell: Does that relate to the matter before us? That relates to the bishops elected by Regional Conferences, and we are talking about Central Conferences.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Dr. Blake says that so far as the Constitution is concerned no line of demarcation is

drawn between the bishops of the Central Conferences and the bishops of the Regional Conferences. Hence, what is applicable to bishops of the Regional Conferences under the new plan is also applicable to the bishops of the Central Conferences, and hence that is in order.

Edgar Blake: I desire to move as a substitute for Dr. Downey's motion that the status of the bishops of the Central Conference be referred to a Special Committee of Conference. It seems to me that we are likely to encounter two or three things which may develop some difference of opinion between the two Commissions. It seems desirable that we should have a Committee on Conferences to whom such matters can be referred for later report. Do I make myself clear?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): You do to me.

Edgar Blake: I move as a substitute for all before us that the status of the bishops for the Central Conferences be referred to a Special Committee of Conference to be made up of three members from each of the two Commissions.

The motion was seconded.

Bishop Mouzon: It may be necessary a little later to refer this matter to the Special Committee, but my judgment is that the entire Commission should discuss it further before turning it over to anybody else. It seems to me an amendment to the report brought in by Dr. Blake and his committee would settle that matter satisfactorily just now. I think it would be settled satisfactorily, if you would add the following: "Provided, that no bishop elected by a Central Conference shall be assigned for supervision to a Regional Conference." I think that would go to the heart of the matter and settle it at once without the necessity of reference.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That, of course, comes in as a part of the speech and not as a motion?

Bishop Mouzon: I want further—

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: The exact language that Bishop Mouzon has adopted has been tentatively adopted by the Joint Commission under "Powers of the General Conference" in a paragraph at the bottom of page 5:

And provided, further, that a bishop shall be assigned for residential supervision to the Regional Jurisdiction by which he was elected, but any bishop may be assigned by the general superintendents to any Annual Conference for presidential supervision if a majority of the resident bishops of the jurisdiction to which he is assigned shall concur in said assignment; and provided still further, that the General Conference may assign a bishop to residence within any jurisdiction with the consent of the delegates of the Regional Conference from which the bishop is to be taken and to which he is to be assigned.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): You have not caught Bishop Mouzon's point at all.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: If I have not, I would like to know what his point is.

Bishop Mouzon: I do not think under the provision which we have made and which you have just read that there would be any likelihood of a bishop's being taken from a Central Conference and assigned to a Regional Conference, but theoretically it is not impossible.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: With the consent of the bishops of the Regional Conference.

Bishop Mouzon: I wish to make it not only practically impossible, but theoretically impossible, so as to make a real distinction between a bishop of the Central Conference and a bishop of the Regional Conference, and if you will add the proviso I have written here you will show that very thing: "Provided, that no bishop elected by a Central Conference shall be assigned for supervision to a Regional Conference."

John F. Goucher: A question of information: If I understand that, that would make a bishop elected by a Central Conference the same as a missionary bishop in our Church?

Bishop Mouzon: Yes, that is what I have in view.

John M. Moore: I realize that Subsection 7, under "Powers" here in the report which we have, does really create the point that we are concerned about, but it does it only by implication, and I think the implication should be more carefully expressed; and when I made the statement a few minutes ago in regard to the point raised by Dr. Thomas it was at that time my purpose to bring this matter up when we discussed the work of the Committee on Conferences. As I understand it, it would not affect this part that we are debating here under the Central Conference, but when we come back to define the powers of the General Conference it was my purpose to introduce this very matter, making it more specific.

Bishop Mouzon: It ought to come in right here.

Frank M. Thomas: I submit that under the report tentatively adopted Subsection 7 under Section 2, "Powers," has no reference whatever to a bishop in a Subregional Conference. We proceed upon the assumption in passing upon that report that there were two kinds of Conferences, Regional and Subregional, and under Section 5 we say, "to define and fix the powers and duties of Subregional Conferences, including their boundaries, and to elect and assign bishops to the same." Under Section 7, "to define and fix the privileges, powers, and duties of the episcopacy, to fix the number of bishops to be elected by each of the several Regional Conferences"—that has reference to Re-

gional Conferences alone. Now, under the proposed amendment this morning, we are passing back into Central Conferences, formerly designated Subregional, "powers and privileges belonging to the Regional Conferences," as first constituted in the report of the Committee on Other Conferences.

David G. Downey: Unquestionably, Dr. Thomas has stated the matter as it is, but it seems to me that the point that is before us and which I judge we are all practically in agreement upon can be completely covered by the insertion of two words when we come to the discussion of the powers of the General Conference. Add to Subsection 7, under "Powers," the following: "And provided, further, that a bishop shall be assigned for residential supervision to a Regional"—insert right there—"to the Regional and Central Jurisdictions by which he was elected, but any bishop may be assigned by the general superintendents to any Annual Conference for presidential supervision if a majority of the jurisdiction to which he is assigned shall consent." Unless I greatly mistake, that confines the bishop elected by the Central Jurisdiction to the Central Jurisdiction and he can be assigned to any Annual Conference within that jurisdiction, provided—

Frank M. Thomas: What confines him?

David G. Downey: The statement right here: "Provided, further, that he shall be assigned for residential supervision to the Regional and Central Jurisdictions by which he was elected." That is specific. And then a further provision is, "provided that he may be assigned to any Annual Conference for presidential supervision if a majority of the jurisdiction to which he is assigned shall consent." Does not that confine him? I think that was the intention of all of us, but I don't care particularly about it.

Frank M. Thomas: But you have a provision by which a bishop can pass from one Regional Conference to another. How do you cover that?

David G. Downey: If there is a provision, it has to be by such practical unanimity as to be almost prohibitive. I do not think it is at all possible—I don't care much about it. I think we can easily get out of the difficulty.

Bishop Leete: It seems to me that there is a matter here upon Conferences, and it has been suggested that there shall be a Committee on Conferences. There are two sides to this. It seems to me that in this paragraph we are doing away with the general superintendency, and I dislike to see the name left if the principle is gone. There is nothing left if it will require consent to assign bishops for presidential supervision. If it requires a majority of all the bishops in the area in which he

goes, there is no general superintendency left. You might as well take the name out, and for my part I do not like to see it go. I am not a stickler for it. I believe the Church has been working toward diocesan episcopacy, and if this is the time to accept it, it may be well. But I feel that it is a very narrow and a very unjust provision that the College of Bishops cannot send a man to preside under a plan that permits the resident bishop to undo anything done within one month. For instance, a bishop comes to preside and he handles the business for a month and after that I can undo it all if I want to. But if we tie ourselves up so that we cannot send a man to preside in any other part of the Church than that from which he was elected we have done away with general superintendency absolutely, and we might as well do away with the term. This looks very small to me. I do not believe we will have any such assignments from the Central Conferences, but it looks to me like the Regional bishop could be trusted to preside, especially when another man comes along who can undo all the work he has done if it is not satisfactory. I would object to this arrangement as here—

Bishop Mouzon: I rise to a point of order.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): State the point.

Bishop Mouzon: Bishop Leete is not discussing the question before us.

Bishop Leete: I am coming to it.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I think Bishop Leete is on the foundation—

Bishop Leete: The periphery—

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That is your word, not mine.

Bishop Leete: And I am getting to the center. You know some of our minds have to work around to the subject like we do in our sermons. Now, there is a certain fact and I want that fact fixed. There is a fact about the Regional Conference. I am willing to put it in the legislation that the brethren shall operate in their respective areas, but I do not want to concede that, unless there is some liberality in reference to the presidency in the Annual Conferences. I think we are a long way off from unity if they cannot preside for a few days.

C. M. Bishop: I rise to a point of order.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): State the point.

C. M. Bishop: That the discussion which Bishop Leete is continuing refers to a portion of the report not before us and that we are under an order to discuss and consider the other report on Central Conferences, and that there is no direct bearing on that to the motion now before us, which is to refer a paper which concerns itself with general superintendency to the Committee on Conferences, whereas we are discussing the powers of

Central Conferences and the significance of the episcopacy in the Central Conferences, which is a different matter.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I think the point is not well taken for this reason: The motion before us is a substitute offered by Dr. Blake to refer certain matters relating to this very question under discussion to the Committee on Conferences, and in the discussion of that motion to refer it is pertinent to discuss the essence of what was originally proposed.

T. N. Ivey: I was willing to vote at once on this matter of referring to the Conference Committee. I was happy to vote for Dr. Blake's substitute, but it seems to me that the matter should be discussed a little bit further. I realize that there are two principles which should be protected. One of those principles is that there should be some difference in the episcopal function pertaining to the Regional Jurisdictions and the Central Jurisdictions. At the same time there is another difficulty which I do not think we can get around, and that is that the plan of our itinerant general superintendency should be maintained. I think, in view of that fact, the language of this paragraph 7, under "Powers" on page 5, was formed. I can see very easily how, according to that thing, we can maintain the plan of our itinerant general superintendency and still afford that protection which Bishop Mouzon and others have spoken of.

Bishop Mouzon: I rise to a point of order.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): State the point.

Bishop Mouzon: The point of order is that a discussion of the powers of the General Conference is out of order when we are discussing the powers of the Central Conferences.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The point of order is not well taken.

Bishop Mouzon: I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): State the grounds of the appeal.

Bishop Mouzon: I have just stated the grounds of my appeal in the remarks I made in making the point of order.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The Chair will state the grounds of his decision. Originally we were considering the powers of the Central Conferences. In that connection a motion was made to insert with the proper change of words the powers that had been tentatively given to the Regional Conferences. That included the words as to the functions of the episcopacy. Then a motion was made to refer to the Committee on Conferences, a matter that pertains to the functions of the episcopacy. Dr. Blake moved as a substitute, instead of going to the Committee on Conferences, that the question should go to a Committee of Conferences. Under the discussion of the ref-

erence of this question pertaining to the functions of the episcopacy to any committee whatever, it seems to me quite competent that the essence of the matter should be discussed by the speaker.

E. B. Chappell: May I inquire—

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): There is nothing in order on the appeal.

E. B. Chappell: I want to ask a question to clarify the atmosphere. What I want to ask is this: Did Dr. Blake's motion include the reference of Dr. Spencer's paper to this subcommittee?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): It did refer to that paper.

E. B. Chappell: I did not so understand. My understanding was that Dr. Blake simply referred this matter of the status of the bishops in the Central Conference to the Special Committee and not Dr. Spencer's paper.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): It carried both.

E. B. Chappell: Did it, Dr. Blake?

Edgar Blake: My language was that we refer the matter of the status of the bishops elected by the Central Conferences to go to a Committee of Conference.

Frank M. Thomas: A Special Committee.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That would not change the ground of the decision of the Chair, and now, except for information, nothing is in order.

Bishop McDowell: I think it will be agreed that Dr. Spencer's paper was read as a special privilege and was really not before us at all. I think that was the whole case. I think Dr. Spencer's paper by his wish ought not at this time to complicate this situation, but that by common consent he was permitted to introduce it, not for action or discussion, but for reference, though it was suggested—

Frank M. Thomas: Moved.

Bishop McDowell: Probably was moved—that it be sent to a Committee of Conference, not on Conferences.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the decision of the Commission? Those agreeing that the decision of the Chair shall be the decision of the Commission shall say "Aye," and those contrary, say "No."

The decision of the Chair was sustained.

E. B. Chappell: Now, to clear up the parliamentary situation, haven't we two distinct motions before us?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The substitute is before us.

E. B. Chappell: Dr. Blake offered his as a substitute for Dr. Downey's motion?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Yes.

Claudius B. Spencer: I must say that I read that paper in response to a request, and that Bishop McDowell has expressed what is in my mind. I do not wish to complicate the matter by having you take up an entirely different phase of it now, but my paper can be taken up at the proper time.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Dr. Ivey has the floor. I recognize him.

T. N. Ivey: As I see it, in discussing the section pertaining to the powers of the Central Conference, the point was made that this matter with reference to the scope of the powers of the Central Conference bishops is not defined and that there is needed protection there. Now, if we make a certain change in paragraph No. 7, under "Powers of the Regional Conferences," that difficulty will be obviated and will fix all things right.

Bishop Mouzon: Please tell us about that.

T. N. Ivey (Reading): "Provided that it shall require a two-thirds vote to require a bishop, without the concurrence of the Regional Conference in which his official residence is fixed"—

C. M. Bishop: A question of inquiry: Is it in order to be discussing the meaning of this paper?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That has been decided by an appeal to the house.

C. M. Bishop: I wish to understand the order.

T. N. Ivey: "And provided, further, that the bishop shall be assigned for presidential supervision to the Regional or Central Jurisdiction," by which he was elected—you put in "simple."

E. B. Chappell: I don't see it.

T. N. Ivey: It is not there, but it should be put in there.

E. B. Chappell: I don't see how it guards the point. That is for residential purposes.

T. N. Ivey: Of course, it is impossible for this thing to take place to which reference has been made. At the same time, that is not guarded in express language, but the impossibility is just as real as if it had been fixed in express language. Consequently, I cannot see, with all deference to my brethren who have been speaking on the other side, why there should be any great change made. If we make the change to which I refer on page 5, paragraph 7, under "Powers," every right will be safeguarded.

Bishop Cooke: I think I fully understand the difficulty in the minds of our brethren, and I fully sympathize with them. Now, in order to help matters along, I suggest that in that same place to which Dr. Ivey has reference we change the word "bishops" and that we leave out some of the words following, so that it shall read, keeping in mind the distinction we have between certain kinds of bishops, "A bishop shall be assigned for residential

jurisdiction to the Regional Jurisdiction by which he was elected, but any general superintendent may be assigned by the general superintendents to any Annual Conference for presidential supervision"—and leave out the remainder. Can I put that in as an amendment?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Not at this time.

Edgar Blake: I don't think the suggestion of Bishop Cooke quite covers the matter. The question at issue is whether the bishop elected by a Central Conference is a general superintendent. We can fix this matter in very short order if you want to fix it limiting them to their jurisdiction. You can insert in Section 4 of the Report on Central Conferences this sentence, which I think will cover everything before us: "The Central Conference shall elect the bishops allotted to it by the General Conference"—now, right there insert a single sentence, "Provided that the privileges, powers, and duties of a bishop elected by a Central Conference shall be limited to that jurisdiction." That makes the thing perfectly clear if you want to do it that way.

R. E. Jones: Bishop Mouzon's wording covers the whole thing.

Edgar Blake: What is that?

Bishop Mouzon: I would like to know what is the parliamentary situation.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The parliamentary situation is that we have before us a motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Conferences.

Bishop Mouzon: What is it that is moved to be referred?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Then a substitute is offered to refer to a Committee of Conference this matter of the functions of a bishop of the Central Conference.

David G. Downey: I made the motion to refer Dr. Spencer's paper to the Standing Committee on Conferences.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Dr. Blake moved as a substitute that took not only that paper, but the whole question of the functions of the bishops of the Central Conferences, to a Committee of Conference between the two Commissions.

David G. Downey: Is it permissible for me to withdraw my motion, which would get Brother Spencer's paper entirely out of the way? I am perfectly willing to do that. We have had the discussion.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Is there any objection to the withdrawal of the original motion? I hear none, and the motion before us then is a motion offered by Dr. Blake, the other motion being withdrawn.

Bishop Mouzon: I accept the wording of Dr. Blake's amendment, and I do not offer the suggestion that I made. I think his is to be preferred to mine.

Edgar Blake: Now, I will state why this should go to the Committee of Conference. It simply provides that the bishop elected by the Central Conference shall be limited in his privileges and powers to that jurisdiction, but it does not provide that a bishop elected by the General Conference for the Central Conference should be limited. Do you catch the difference? It seems to me that those two matters should have very careful consideration by the Committee on Conferences.

Rolla V. Watt: I move the previous question.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The motion is to refer all this matter that has been under discussion to a Committee of Conference.

A vote being taken, the motion to refer was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): How shall the Committee of Conference be appointed?

Bishop McDowell: I move that the committee be appointed by the Chairmen of the respective Commissions.

The motion was seconded.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Is it understood that the appointment shall be made by the Chairman of each Commission of three each? It will take that course by general consent. I should, of course, want to have some little consultation with some of my brethren. I can announce at the close of the morning session. Bishop Cranston can make his announcement at the proper time.

John M. Moore: Now, we are ready to pass on the last sentence of Section 4, which reads: "The powers and privileges of each Central Conference having less than 150,000 Church members in full connection shall be determined by the General Conference."

Edgar Blake: It would seem to me perfectly proper and wise for us to adopt the committee's proposed amendment inasmuch as that amendment does not concern the powers of the bishop, but simply provides that the General Conference may elect a bishop, and the question of the powers should come in under the report later, and we could not define the powers of the Central Conference here.

John M. Moore: That was my point that was made before this discussion was entered upon.

Edgar Blake: I move the adoption of the amendment offered by the committee: Dr. Moore, Dr. Jones, and myself. I will read it:

Subject to the restrictions and limitations of this Constitution and to the rules and regulations adopted by the General Conference in relation to the connectional affairs of the Church, each Associate General Conference having not less than 150,000 Church members in full connection shall have the power to elect from time to time—

Maybe I had better read the opening part of the report:

Subject to the restrictions and limitations of this Constitution and to the rules and regulations adopted by the General Conference in relation to the connectional affairs of the Church, each Central Conference having not less than 150,000 Church members in full connection shall have authority to legislate regarding the distinctively regional affairs of its area; and to elect from time to time the number of bishops allotted to it by the General Conference, to be confirmed by the General Conference and ordained by the bishops.

I move the adoption of that.

E. B. Chappell: Are you reading the report?

Edgar Blake: No, sir; I am moving this as a substitute for that part of Section 4 which begins with the words "have authority" in the fourth line and ends with the words "general superintendent" in the seventh line.

H. M. Du Bose: I want to make a correction there in the first paragraph of Section 4. The word there should not be "area." It should be "jurisdiction." It covers various areas. It should read, "should have control over all distinctly jurisdictional affairs within that area."

John M. Moore: That is all right. That is a matter of editing.

Edgar Blake: That is all it is, simply something editorial.

H. M. Du Bose: It is important.

Edgar Blake: But it does not change the context.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That is accepted and incorporated in the resolution on which you vote, and you vote with the understanding that the functions of the episcopacy go to the General Conference and hence are not settled tentatively by this vote.

A vote being taken, the motion was carried.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Now, what is the rest of that?

John M. Moore: The remaining part is, "the powers and privileges of each Central Conference having less than 150,000 Church members in full connection shall be determined by the General Conference." I move that we adopt that.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

John M. Moore: The next section reads: "Each Central Jurisdiction shall be entitled to be represented in the General Conference by five ministerial and five lay delegates, who shall be elected by its Associate Regional Conference at the regular meeting preceding the meeting of the General Conference." This is one of the three features that were discussed by the

Commission of the Church, South, the other two being the preamble to Article VIII. and Subsection 3, under Section 3, on the fourth page, which reads: "To elect not exceeding five ministerial and five lay representatives to the General Conference, who shall have the right to speak in the General Conference and in its standing committees on all matters which relate to and affect the interests of the jurisdiction which they represent. But said representatives shall not have the right to vote." I will say, speaking for the members of my Commission, that those were the matters that were before us as fundamental. The discussion we had in our separate meeting was upon these, and our Commission accepted in good faith the fundamental principle in these three statements, and I move the adoption of the paragraph as read.

The motion was seconded.

Rolla V Watt: We come now to a point concerning which there is probably some difference of opinion. Doubtless the illuminating debate of five days served to enable us to understand each other as we never did before. I did not participate in that debate, but I have no hesitancy in saying that my own views were greatly modified by it. I came here, as no doubt others did, set upon full numerical representation of colored people in the General Conference. I still believe that the colored man is entitled to that. With rare magnanimity, the representatives of these people have said they were convinced that the colored people would surrender some of their rights for the sake of unification of these two great Churches, but they have no more right to pledge their people than you and I have ours—and none of us will have the temerity to say what the verdict will be when the agreements and the disagreements here are submitted to a vote. We have come to understand the difficulties you brethren of the Church, South, face; but we have difficulties of our own. What we do must run the gantlet of the two General Conferences and about two hundred Annual Conferences. May we not give a little here and there on both sides? It is a long way between equal numerical representation and a fixed representation of ten delegates in the General Conference. The distance is too great in my judgment. It is also illogical to allow the same representation to 30,000 in Latin America as to the 315,000 colored members of our Church. There should be some difference; and to that end I wish to offer an amendment in a moment or two to which I want to invite your consideration. An arbitrary representation is an abridgment of the rights of those who are equally entitled to representation as ourselves. I have heard the high tributes to the development of the negro paid by the speakers on both sides and I think, if anything, the remarks of that character were stronger from the delegates of the Church,

South, than from ours, because you are more acquainted with this development of the race. I contend that the colored people have improved by their association with us. We need them, it is true, but they perhaps need us more than we need them. When they come to our General Conference, when they meet our people and learn our standards and carry them back to their people, they are strengthened in their contention for higher standards. We believe there should be at least a variation in the representation in the General Conference—enough difference so that the representation may not be so very arbitrary, and I offer this amendment as a substitute for the report of the committee:

Each Central Conference shall elect two ministerial and two lay delegates to the General Conference, and one additional ministerial and one additional lay delegate for each 50,000 full members of the Church or fractional two-thirds thereof above the first 30,000 members; provided, that the maximum number of delegates from any Central Conference shall be twenty.

The result of that at the present time would be that the colored Conference would have 16 delegates, the Latin American 4, the European, Eastern Asia, and Southern Asia 6 delegates—a total of 38 as against 50 provided for in the report of the committee. I submit that for your consideration.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Is the amendment seconded?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I second the amendment.

John M. Moore: I am opposed to the amendment proposed by Mr. Watt. I hardly think it would be fair to the other regions, I mean the Latin American, European, Eastern Asiatic, and Southern Asiatic. These regions include several countries. This No. 10 was designed in order that these various countries might have some representation in the General Conference. It is not that they may have special power in the General Conference, but that they may be related to the General Conference. If you take this sliding scale suggested by Brother Watt, you will only put in two members from the Latin American countries. Four members from the Latin American countries, including Porto Rico, Cuba, and Mexico, and several Central American states, and several more from South American states, and as the result of that these countries could not be represented in the General Conference. They have simply a composite delegate from some country that they were not perhaps specially interested in. If you have ten delegates, these ten can be distributed in such way that each nation will have one of its own representatives in the General Conference. The same is true of Europe and all those other countries. These ten shall not be chosen carelessly, but with this object in view; and as far as the

negro vote is concerned, if you make the number sixteen, you will not have changed the power of the negro. Ten men can represent them just about as well as sixteen. All you have won in this is a principle, and that principle we have admitted. We have accepted this paragraph and the preamble to Article VIII., Subsection 3, under "Privileges of the Associate General Conference," as a link. These three have been put in together, and with those three things together we believe there is a justice in the whole arrangement that perhaps may enable us to appeal to our constituency with effectiveness. I trust that there shall be no change whatever in the arrangement that we have made, and I would not at all support this plan that Brother Watt has suggested.

W. N. Ainsworth: I am bound to oppose the amendment which has been offered by Mr. Watt. The essence of the report which we have agreed to is the fixed representation that is provided for in this report—namely, five ministers and five laymen from a Central Conference in the General Conference. This whole basis of representation for the Central Conferences is provided on the general ground that they are really Missionary Jurisdictions, and we are not seeking to provide representation for them on the basis of numbers, but we are seeking to provide such representation as will furnish the opportunity for wise counsel with them with reference to the arrangements of their jurisdictions. Moreover, no new conditions have arisen in our negotiations since we agreed to this provision. At the time this provision was agreed to—

Bishop Leete: You mean tentatively, do you not?

Bishop McDowell: That has never been agreed to at all.

W. N. Ainsworth: At the time this provision was agreed to in essence, the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church—

Bishop Leete: I do not wish to be discourteous, Dr. Ainsworth, but you know how often we did say all through the negotiations when these things were drawn up that we were only doing it tentatively, and I hope the Doctor will concede that, not that it affects the ultimate result, but it affects the record. I hope he will not put us down as having agreed in essence or in effect, for we haven't up to this moment. May we not have that understood without any discourtesy?

Bishop Mouzon: If Dr. Ainsworth would permit, I should like to inquire just how the motion was by the passage of which we adopted in principle this report which is before us.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): You call for a reading of the paper?

Bishop, Mouzon: It might be well enough to settle that before we go on.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The Secretary will answer that from his official record.

Bishop Mouzon: I made a motion and Dr. Blake offered a substitute.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): As a matter, though I cannot answer officially, Dr. Blake offered a resolution which was adopted.

Secretary Thomas: That was that the report be the basis.

W. N. Ainsworth: When the two Commissions agreed to the report as a basis of our further procedure, the essence that was involved in it was the fixed ratio of five ministers and five laymen from the Central Conferences in the General Conference. No new conditions have arisen since then for us to change this basis of representation. At that time the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church had been invited, in the terms of this paper, to become a part of this amalgamation, and I call attention to the further fact that it was provided that whenever the colored jurisdictions should reach 600,000 they should become an Associate General Conference, which was contemplated when the essence of the report was adopted.

Rolla V. Watt: I rise to a point of order.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): State the point.

Rolla V. Watt: There was not any agreement that was a final agreement among us, and there was no bad faith among us.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): No bad faith is now being suggested, and there is nothing in the point of order.

Rolla V. Watt: It seems to me it is very close to that.

W. N. Ainsworth: It was contemplated that the basis of representation in the General Conference which is assigned to the Central Conference should be unchanged from the beginning up to the time such jurisdiction should reach 600,000 in membership. Now, the conditions not having in any way changed since this provision was originally made and in some sense agreed to, I am opposed to any change in the basis of representation at this time, and I must throw out this warning, that we had best carefully consider before we tear up this basis of representation for the Central Conferences, lest we find ourselves landed in another five days' debate. I must, therefore, oppose the amendment suggested by Mr. Watt and hold to the provisions of this report.

David G. Downey: I rise simply to make clear one point. You will recall, and I think the members of the Commission will recall, that when we were debating here on accepting the report of the Committee of Eight emphasis was placed upon certain principles and Bishop Mouzon rose and stated that the principles were contained in this section before us and in the

preamble to Article VIII. At that time I rose and very distinctly stated in the presence of the Joint Commission that the principle contained in this article before us for discussion was real representation of the Central Conference in the General Conference, but that the method of that representation, which is the very thing we are now discussing, whether it should be fixed and static or proportionate, was in the twilight zone of open debate. I further stated that the erection of these Central Conferences into Associate General Conferences or Jurisdictional General Conferences was the principle underlying the preamble to Article VIII., but the method whereby that principle should be wrought out, whether it should be mandatory or whether that mandatory provision should be modified, that also was in the twilight zone of debate. That was stated before we adopted the report of the Committee of Eight, and I simply rise to say that nothing was decided definitely, and in all fairness we should consider that these matters are still before us for brotherly conversation and adjustment. These are matters that do not affect the underlying principle; we should understand that, and there should be no conversation back and forth as to the perfect right of either body to suggest and propose amendments. Indeed, that was strictly stated in the paper that we presented to you, and that you accepted. So it seems to me that all these matters are perfectly before us and are just the matters upon which we ought to come to some agreement.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The official record substantially agrees with the statement made by the other Secretary, Dr. Thomas.

John F. Goucher: I simply rise, first, to differ with Dr. Ainsworth as to the interpretation of the principles that we agreed to make this basis; second, I understand the principle was that there should be representation of the Central Conferences in the General Conference, in the broad question before us legislating for a world-wide ministry of Methodism. I very greatly prefer to have a movable representation, commencing at the minimum and proceeding as the Central Conferences shall qualify by enlarged membership to an increased representation; but over against that there are other questions which should enter into the consideration—namely, the question that has been brought out here that the Latin American area includes Porto Rico and Cuba and Mexico and Central America and the Spanish and Portuguese work in South America, representing large areas and large possibilities—I can see, therefore, the difficulty of inadequate representation by having only two or four representatives as a start.

Rolla V. Watt: We have four as a minimum.

John F. Goucher: By having four as a starting point, two ministerial and two lay delegates, I can see the same difficulty when you consider the work in Eastern Asia. If we move properly in this, I believe Japan will enter into this arrangement and Korea, the Philippines, and Malaysia, and there are islands there as well as peninsulas; China, with its seventeen provinces in which we are at work, and there are the countries of Europe, and four would not be an adequate representation at all. In conversation with Bishop Bashford (of whom I need say nothing except to mention his name), he said to me his objection to this proposed plan was that it did not function where the greatest need exists, that he felt the mission fields ought to have special consideration and enlarged representation. Now, we can do one of two things. Shall we adjust ourselves by anticipation by a fixed representation of ten for each of these Central Conferences or shall we withhold that ten and require them to qualify by increased membership? Under the circumstances, while I should prefer to see a sliding scale, from year to year, I believe for efficiency a fixed number will be most desirable.

H. M. Du Bose: If the brethren are inclined to hear me for a few minutes, I should like to speak on this subject. If they are not—

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): You have the floor and nobody can move to adjourn until you have finished.

H. M. Du Bose: Some of the very remarkable things which have arisen during the progress of our debates have grown out of the first of these considerations, our recommendation of the claims upon us of the outlying regions of the mission field. But a very crucial one has expressed itself in the situation, and in the needs of our colored brethren; and it is about that particularly that our discussions have moved; and upon it, at last, we have expected and hoped to reach a definite and satisfactory conclusion. Now, while I do not recognize that we have come to any certain action, I have found myself a little confused in my memory that we had agreed that this amendment should be proposed; but whether we did or not, it would be quite in order, at any stage, for an amendment to be brought in, and it would only be our pleasure, I am sure, on both sides to consider this amendment, but, as a matter of fact, great movements of thought and great growing emotions have expressed themselves in the actions on both sides in the viewpoint which we have forced ourselves to take. We have helped ourselves through prayer and meditation concerning these matters—all of them crucial; and we have, at least, set before us certain ideals, and we have approached nearer to these ideals, and in doing so

each side has approached the other. I expressed myself in the meeting of our Commission yesterday morning—

E. C. Reeves: A question of privilege: This question cannot be discussed under the five-minute rule, and I move that that be abolished for the present.

George Warren Brown: We haven't time enough to give any member more than five minutes.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Brother Du Bose has the floor. This will not be taken out of your time.

H. M. Du Bose: We have approached these ideals and have come to a happy agreement. As a member I believe there is only a narrow stream now separating us, and I am willing to meet in the middle of the stream that separates us. We have come together in the middle, not in the water, but upon an island just large enough to stand on, and I am afraid that if we move to the right or to the left from the happy conclusions we have reached on these considerations, we might get into deep water. It has percolated through the cranial bones of our people that the maximum representation of these Central Conferences—of course the crucial one is the one in the home land—will be ten. On the basis of that we have come to an expression of the condition from our side—about it has crystallized the thought not only of the Commission but of a large segment of the membership of our Church. We can agree on the principle as established. It is a recognition of the rights of our colored members, and a recognition of the quality and brotherhood that exists between us and cannot be greatly increased or changed as to numbers; so it seems to me that the happy situation which has been brought about should be adhered to. I say that, not in the way of any litigious inconsistency, but as being necessary in the continuation of the lines of thought on which we have been moving. And I add this: That we ought not to complicate ourselves with what may be the demands or needs or rights of the membership of the Colored M. E. Church if its members eventually come to us. I used the term in our Commission the other morning which has become familiar—that is, *ultra vires*. It is *ultra vires* our authority, and the elimination of that matter might decrease our difficulties. I hope we shall find ourselves able to stand upon the conclusion, so far as it has been matured, of ten representatives in the General Conference. That will facilitate our future consideration, and will be the means in our hands of accomplishing the ends desired in our arguments with our people.

Bishop Hamilton: I think you will all remember that it was I who asked what the word "principle" was to mean. There are a great many meanings given in the lexicon, and we should

know now just which one is involved in the use of the word, that our candor may not be called in question when differences arise in the discussion later on. Bishop Atkins told a capital story humorously illustrating how it might not matter whatever definition was given to it. Nevertheless, a very excellent speech, in line with what I had suggested, followed, and was made by our clear-headed brother, the presiding officer, who never has any difficulty in making us understand what he means. Now, I don't want any brother to think before I have said anything, because I have the floor, which does sometimes happen here, that I am going to say something about the social equality of the races in the five or three minutes I am to speak. In what I am to say, I shall have no reference whatever to the colored membership. What I had in mind concerning the plan we are considering was its application to the whole-world membership of the Church. Europe must be included in whatever plan we adopt. It is a mistake to class the members there with the converts added to the Church in India, China, and other mission fields. They are very sensitive in Europe over the designation of their several states as missionary territory, and our members resent the classification of their Annual Conferences as Missions. They seem to think the people in Europe are not pagans. Their Annual Conferences want the same kind of representation in the General Conference that the Annual Conferences in this country want. And why not? If there is anything that will be certain when this war is over, it is that we will not be able to discriminate against any of the belligerent peoples on that continent and hope to keep them in our communion. We will do well to leave well enough alone over there. There will be, as there always have been, just as intelligent delegations from the Annual Conferences in Europe in the General Conference as from Annual Conferences in this country. And if there is to be any tampering with the representation of Europe, this is not the time to do it. Let the Annual Conferences have the representation they now have. And if we feel that we cannot afford to pay the traveling expenses of the delegates from Europe, say it to their faces when they are here as members of the General Conference with the rest of us. This is what I had in mind when I raised the question, What does the word "principle" mean? I did not want any brother to say or think, when we had voted on the plan, that we had violated even a gentleman's agreement when the wrong impression would come from the use or abuse of an ambiguous term. I repeat, then, you cannot apply the missionary plan to Europe, and some kind of exception should be made, whether it is made by amendment or Europe be dealt with just as we deal with this country.

Abram W. Harris: A matter of privilege of the house: I have here the exact action taken, and I can read it if you wish. The reading was called for.

Abram W. Harris: First before us was a motion that the joint session accept the report of the committee in principle, but without committing the Commissioners to all its provisions, and provided that any member of the Joint Commission have liberty to propose by motion any change he may desire.

H. M. Du Bose: That is the point I am making.

Abram W. Harris: Then it was moved by Dr. Blake, as a substitute for all before the house, that we accept the report of the Committee of Eight as the basis of a plan for determining the status of the negro and the foreign jurisdictions, and that we proceed to consider the report *seriatim*. The substitute was accepted. Dr. Thomas called for the previous question, which was ordered. The motion offered by Dr. Blake was adopted by a vote of 30 to 8.

Bishop Mouzon: No one raises any question as to the perfect right of Brother Watt or any one else to bring in any amendment which they propose.

E. B. Chappell: Certainly not.

Bishop Mouzon: Certainly not. I called for the reading of the paper and the paper was read, and we all had a clear understanding to begin with that any amendment might be proposed by any one of us during the progress of this discussion. Let that be perfectly clear. Now, there are some of us who came to the conclusion after great deliberation, and after considerable hesitancy, but finally we consented to a fixed number of delegates for these Central Conferences, which were all Missionary Conferences. It makes no difference whether you call them Missionary or not, but they are missionary. Some of us finally agreed to this fixed and limited representation for two reasons: The first has been clearly stated by Dr. Ainsworth, and I would repeat it in order that you may focus your attention upon it again. These do occupy each a missionary relationship to the general Church, and for that reason we finally agreed to a fixed and limited representation from each of these missionary areas. There is another reason why we agreed to it. We were looking forward to the time when the colored membership of the united Church should be erected into an Associate General Conference. It is provided that as soon as the number reaches 600,000 it shall be erected into an Associate General Conference; and we stress the word "shall," for a weaker word will not satisfy us. We agreed temporarily to this as a stepping stone to the erection of the Central Conference into an Associate General Conference by and by. That is something

we are looking forward to. Beyond that it is our conviction that ultimately the colored membership of the Church should be erected into an independent Church, but in the meantime we have agreed to this fixed and limited representation, and for two reasons: First, because of the missionary relationship of the Central Conferences; and, second, because we hoped that the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church might be brought in and that at an early day the colored membership of the united Church may be erected into an Associate General Conference.

John J. Wallace: I want to call attention to this fact, which we seem to be overlooking: There are two kinds of representation, proportionate representation and limited representation. We have agreed to limited representation, but there are two methods by which limited representation may be fixed. It may be arbitrarily fixed at a certain figure, and it may be fixed by another method—namely, a minimum and a maximum. That recognizes the principle just as certainly as the arbitrary method does, and our objection—I take it the objection Brother Watt has in mind—was not to the fixing, but to the arbitrary fixing. Let me suggest a method by which we may fix the representation without arbitrarily fixing it, and at the same time without changing the figures to any appreciable extent. This method would also cover Dr. Moore's suggestion that some other jurisdictions would not be adequately provided for—Latin America for example, and Eastern Asia as Dr. Goucher has pointed out. My suggestion is this:

Each Central Conference having in its jurisdiction 100,000 or less Church members in full connection shall elect four ministerial and four lay delegates to the General Conference, and one ministerial and one lay delegate for each additional 100,000 Church members in full connection, or a fraction of two-thirds thereof; *provided*, that the maximum number of delegates from a Central Conference shall not exceed eighteen.

It would be eighteen automatically at the time they reach 600,000 full members, but we put it in the bond that they shall not exceed eighteen. That would give to each of these foreign jurisdictions eighteen members to begin with, so that the delegates could be distributed among their Conferences. This method would give the Afro-American, as we call it—this Central Conference representing the work among our colored people—twelve delegates, and they would have to gain 66,666 members before they could have any further representation.

Bishop McDowell: In fact, 25,000 would bring them up.

John J. Wallace: No, they have 315,000 now. In this way you recognize the principle of a limited representation, but you do not arbitrarily fix it. The difference, so far as the Central Conference embracing the work among colored people goes,

is simply a matter of figures, of ten or twelve. This suggestion does provide for the other objection as well.

John M. Moore: Read that again.

John J. Wallace (Reading):

Each Central Conference having in its jurisdiction 100,000 or less Church members in full connection shall elect four ministerial and four lay delegates to the General Conference, and one ministerial and one lay delegate for each additional 100,000 Church members in full connection, or a fraction of two-thirds thereof; *provided*, that the maximum number of delegates from a Central Conference shall not exceed eighteen.

W. N. Ainsworth: It is ten minutes to one o'clock, and I move that we adjourn.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

"Praise God, from whom all blessings flow" was sung, and the Commission was dismissed with benediction by Rev. John F. Goucher.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Joint Commission was called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Collins Denny.

Dr. John J. Wallace conducted the devotional exercises.

The hymn, "How sweet the name of Jesus sounds," was sung.

Prayer was offered by Dr. Wallace.

The roll was called and the following were present: Bishops Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Ministers: F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar, Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. J. Wallace, C. M. Stuart. Laymen: H. N. Snyder, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock.

The minutes of the morning session were read, corrected, and approved.

Bishop Frederick D. Leete took the chair as presiding officer.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): Will the retiring Chairman kindly state the condition of affairs?

Bishop Denny: A motion was made by Brother Watt and Brother Wallace offered a substitute and the substitute is before the Commission.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): May I say that we are all very weary after two weeks of labor, and I notice when we

are weary our minds are not quite as near the surface as they should be, and our feelings are somewhat nearer the surface than they ought to be, and I hope you will all assist the Chair in keeping perfect harmony and unity of spirit. The substitute of Dr. Wallace is before us.

Rolla V. Watt: The argument that Brother Wallace makes for a little representation in the foreign Central Conferences is somewhat appealing. The only difficulty about it is that it reduces slightly the representation of our colored friends in the General Conference; but it does not change the principle I was after, and it has one advantage in that it automatically works up to the point of 600,000 members, and therefore I would, with the consent of my second, accept that in lieu of my own motion.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I seconded the motion, and I do not consent.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): The motion remains as it was.

E. B. Chappell: I would like to hear Brother Wallace's amendment or substitute or whatever you call it.

Dr. Wallace's substitute was read, as follows:

Each Central Conference having in its jurisdiction 100,000 or less Church members in full connection shall elect four ministerial and four lay delegates to the General Conference, and one ministerial and one lay delegate for each additional 100,000 Church members in full connection, or a fraction of two-thirds thereof; *provided*, that the maximum number of delegates from a Central Conference shall not exceed eighteen.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): Is there any brother who wishes to discuss it? If not, the amendment of Brother Wallace is before us for action.

Edgar Blake: In view of the difference developing this morning in the discussion, it seems to me that it would be wise to refer this item to the Committee of Conference. One other item has already gone to that committee. It is possible that there may be one or two other items that ought to be considered in conference. I move you as a substitute for all before us that the item before us be referred to the Committee of Conference for its consideration.

The motion was seconded.

H. M. Du Bose: May I ask when the Committee of Conference will meet, whether immediately or whether sometime between now and the next session?

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): The Chair does not know, but hopes that it will be at once.

Edgar Blake: The Committee of Conference may meet this afternoon, or earlier if desired. I would propose that the best

thing is to push matters through, and when we develop a difference like we did this morning to refer it to the Committee of Conference.

H. M. Du Bose: That is satisfactory.

A vote being taken, the motion to refer was carried.

John M. Moore: The next clause is Section 5, Subsection 1:

Each Central Conference shall meet not more than six nor less than three months in advance of the regular meeting of the General Conference, at such time and place as may be determined, and at such other times and places as it may itself determine. Special meetings of any Associate Regional Conference may be convened by the bishops of its jurisdiction and shall be convened whenever a majority of the Annual Conferences and Mission Conferences of the jurisdiction shall request such special session.

I move the adoption of that section.

W. N. Ainsworth: I call attention to a little irregularity: If we adopt this recall aright, it has been provided that the Central Conferences having not less than 150,000 Church members in full connection shall elect the bishops allotted to them by the General Conference and these bishops are to be confirmed by the General Conference. It would, therefore, be necessary to make some provision for a meeting of such Central Conferences at a time when they can pass upon this matter of the election of their bishops, so that they can be confirmed or rejected by the General Conference.

E. B. Chappell: I think Dr. Ainsworth's point is well taken—namely, if these Central Conferences meet three or six months before the General Conference, there will be no way by which they can know how many bishops they are to elect, and they cannot therefore elect the bishops until after the General Conference meets. I do not know of any matter that to me is more important than that. The Central Conferences have to elect their delegates to the General Conference. We shall have to provide some way for the first meeting of the Central Conferences, and I want to offer the following amendment to this paragraph, namely: "*Provided*, that the first session of each Central Conference shall be convened at such time and place as the general superintendents may direct." That would authorize the general superintendents to fix the time and place of the meetings of the Central Conferences before the meeting of the General Conference. Of course that does not meet the matter raised by Dr. Ainsworth; but that can be covered, I think, by the Central Conference providing to adjourn to meet at a time when the General Conference itself is in session. The General Conference could then take action concerning the number of bishops to be elected by each Central Conference, and the

Central Conference could follow the action of the General Conference by electing the number of bishops allotted to it and the bishops so elected could come to the General Conference before its adjournment for ordination.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Is not that covered by the provision "not more than six and not less than three months in advance"?

Edgar Blake: Who determines where to meet?

George Warren Brown: Where would the amendment come in?

Edgar Blake: My opinion is that it would come at the end of paragraph 1, after the words "special session."

H. M. Du Bose: I would suggest a possible solution of that difficulty: Provided that every four years—that is, in the year in which the General Conference meets—the Central Conference shall meet at the same time that the General Conference does, so that there may be communications between it and the Central Conference. It can thus be known how many bishops they are to elect, and those bishops elected by the Central Conference can be reported for confirmation to the General Conference during its sitting.

John M. Moore: There are a good many troubles here, and I mentioned them in the committee. I am not sure how we can work them out. I thought this provision for special meetings might help us, but I do not know about that now. Suppose a Central Conference meets in February and elects the delegates to the General Conference. The General Conference declares that that Central Conference may elect bishops. When will that Central Conference meet to elect those two bishops? Suppose it meets during the same month of May and the two bishops are elected during the month of May. One of them is in Lucknow and one is in Shanghai and one is in Petrograd and one is in Rio Janeiro.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): Those are a good many places for two bishops to be at the same time.

John M. Moore: There are two in each Central Conference.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): The Chair would like to know which is at Lucknow.

John M. Moore: You will see at once that there are difficulties. They could not get to the General Conference for confirmation, so that the confirmation would have to take place at another time than at the time of the election.

Edgar Blake: The only jurisdiction that will be affected by the episcopal jurisdiction to the first General Conference is the colored membership. The others, on account of their limited numbers, will not have a right to election, so that Lucknow will not come in at this particular time. At the first session of the General Conference, the General Conference will fix some

principle for determining the number of bishops that a Central Conference can elect. As it stands now, only those Central Conferences that have 150,000 members or more elect bishops. The General Conference elects the bishops for the other Central Conferences. So that we are not in difficulty at this time if we provide for convening the first meeting, the time and place, and I think the motion offered does so provide. I think the whole thing can be handled in that way. For instance, the Colored Conference, which is the one in question, would meet previous to the meeting of the General Conference and elect its delegates and adjourn to meet at the time the General Conference is in session in order that it might act upon allotments. It is perfectly clear and there is no special difficulty at that point, provided we adopt such provision as I suggest.

H. M. Du Bose: Then let the Central Conference hold a special session during the meeting of the General Conference.

Edgar Blake: I hardly think that is necessary.

E. B. Chappell: Let us pass this amendment that Dr. Blake offers, and then let us leave something for the General Conference to do. We cannot do everything in all these minute details, and I think we can safely say that the General Conference can settle a few things after it meets. Let us pass the amendment offered by Dr. Blake, which provides for the convening of the first session of the Central Conference, and I think the General Conference can be trusted to take care of the rest.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): Do you second Dr. Blake's motion? I do not see where it has been seconded.

E. B. Chappell: I do. I thought it was seconded.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): It was not, but it is now, so it is all right.

Bishop Denny: I would like to have that read again.

The amendment of Dr. Blake was read as follows: "Provided, that the first meeting of a Central Conference shall be convened at such time and place as the general superintendents may direct."

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

E. B. Chappell: I move that this paragraph 1 of Section 5, as amended, be adopted.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

John M. Moore: The next is Section 2 of that same paragraph No. 5:

The effective bishops resident within a Central Jurisdiction shall preside over the session of the Central Conference thereof, as said bishops may themselves determine; but if there shall be no bishop resident in the jurisdiction of said Conference at the time of its session, the general superintendents shall designate one of their number for such presidency.

I move the adoption of that paragraph of that section.

The motion was seconded.

Bishop Hamilton: Do I understand that so long as there are living any colored bishops no white general superintendents shall preside in any of their Central Conferences?

John M. Moore: That comes up under "Powers of the General Conference."

Bishop Hamilton: Will they consider it?

John M. Moore: I do not know.

Bishop Hamilton: If they will consider it—

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): If Bishop Hamilton will pardon me, I think we should go according to parliamentary procedure and take up these matters in logical order.

Bishop Hamilton: I am willing, if it will come up at some time.

John M. Moore: It will come up.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): The question is upon the adoption of paragraph 2 of Section 5.

A vote being taken, the section was agreed to.

John M. Moore: Now, Article VIII.:

Any Central Conference by a majority vote of its members present and voting, with the concurrence of a majority of the members of the several Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions of its jurisdiction, present and voting, and with the approval of the General Conference, may become an Associate General Conference; and when it has 600,000 Church members in full connection shall become an Associate General Conference with the privileges and powers herein contained.

Edgar Blake: I desire to offer an amendment that we substitute the word "Jurisdictional" for "Associate" wherever it occurs before the words "General Conference."

The motion was seconded.

John M. Moore: I will not oppose that. Insert the word "Jurisdictional" instead of "Associate" all the way through. This is a General Conference for a section of the Church to do certain things. So, as far as I am concerned, I want it to remain a General Conference, but of course a Jurisdictional General Conference.

A. J. Lamar: Does that start off then, "Any Jurisdictional Regional Conference" or "Any Jurisdictional Central Conference"?

John M. Moore: No, it starts off "Any Central Conference," and the word that is changed is the "Associate" before "General Conference."

A reading of the section as it would stand with the amendments suggested was called for, and was read as follows:

Any Central Conference by a majority vote of its members, present

and voting, with the concurrence of a majority of the members of the several Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions of its jurisdiction, present and voting, and with the approval of the General Conference, may become a Jurisdictional General Conference; and when it has 600,000 Church members in full connection shall become a Jurisdictional General Conference with the privileges and powers herein provided.

John M. Moore: All the change in the section that is proposed by the amendment is simply to change the word "Associate" to "Jurisdictional" where it comes before "General Conference," so that all through this Article VIII. wherever the words "Associate General Conference" occur, let it be called "Jurisdictional General Conference." Will Dr. Blake accept that in lieu of his motion to just this first part?

Edgar Blake: I will withdraw my motion to save time that would be consumed on debating each one.

John M. Moore: Then, I move that the word "Associate," wherever it appears in this article before the words "General Conference," be changed to "Jurisdictional."

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): The Chair is in doubt whether you should make this motion.

H. M. Du Bose: I make the motion then.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

John M. Moore: I now move that we adopt this Article VIII., first section, as amended.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I move that we amend by striking out the words in the fourth and fifth lines,

And when it shall have 600,000 Church members in full connection shall become a Jurisdictional General Conference,

so that the clause would read:

Any Central Conference, by a majority vote of its members present and voting, with the concurrence of a majority of the members of the several Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions of its jurisdiction, present and voting, and with the approval of the General Conference, may become an Associate General Conference with the privileges and powers herein provided.

The motion was seconded.

John M. Moore: That matter has been thoroughly discussed in the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. It was a part of this chain of three links, fundamental principles of this paper adopted by us by a good majority, but at the same time we had a strong minority that did not vote for the motion; however, our Commission stands very strongly for the preamble as it is here in the paper. We would be glad if Mr. Simpson's motion does not prevail.

T N. Ivey: I simply ask Dr. Moore this question: Is it not a fact that this principle was adopted unanimously by our Commission?

John M. Moore: I cannot say that.

T N. Ivey: I may be in error, but that was my idea.

John M. Moore: I think our Commission stood unanimously that there should be no change in this preamble. I think I may say that.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: In order that all the cards may be on the table, I desire to say that our Commission, I think unanimously—certainly with substantial unanimity—approved the striking out of the words which I have moved to be stricken out. I was one of the Committee of Eight, and I was willing that this report should come in as it came in. There has been a change in the situation, and a very material change in the situation, Dr. Ainsworth, from the situation in which it was at the time this report came in. If there were no other reasons why these words should come out, that reason finds a resting place in what Bishop Mouzon said this morning. He said, as you will recall, that the Southern Church, or the delegates—I think he included them all; I don't think he limited it to himself—were looking forward to the time when there should be no colored members of our Church, but that they be formed in an entirely separate organization, and these things (particularly the one I am referring to) were the stepping stone to that end. With that provision I am wholly in discord. I do not profess to be one of those who are particularly well posted in the signs of the times, though it would not be difficult to point out that all the signs of the times look toward the bringing of all the people together, and all Christian denominations together; but without putting myself in a position of interpreting the signs of the times, I wish it to be distinctly recorded that I am among those who fail to find in the written word of Christ anything which justifies any disavowance of those who are his brethren and those who are his children. My hope goes a long way beyond the unification of the Methodist Episcopal Church, North and South. For a good many years, up to a comparatively recent time, the Christian Churches have been indulging in disavowance upon matters which, in my judgment, were immaterial differences. The whole religion of Jesus Christ rests in his word, and those things which have divided the Christian Churches, in my judgment, are of such trivial importance as compared with the two great commandments that they might well have been forgotten, so that the whole Christian people might be working together. I look for the time when there will not only be a uniting, as is contemplated, of the Methodist and the Presbyterian Churches of Canada, but when there will be only one great

Christianity working together for the evangelization of the world, to the time when every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess that Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father. I cannot see, knowing humanity as I know it, how any set of men, I do not care who they are, nor how honest they are, nor how much they believe in their own good intentions—I do not see how any set of men, having an ultimate end looking to disseverance, can be sympathetic of action to those belonging to their own denomination who have a desire that the existing relation shall continue. I can well believe, if Bishop Mouzon will excuse me for mentioning it, but he mentioned it this morning—I can well believe that Bishop Mouzon, in the action he would take, would honestly strive and with equal honesty believe that that which he was doing would be for the good of the colored members; but his humanity, as long as it remains, will no more permit him to lose sight of the fact that he desires that ultimate severance than mine will permit me to lose sight of the fact that I am on the opposite side. Certainly the actions of the two General Conferences—certainly the action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at Oklahoma, did not look forward to any such thing as this. It did recommend an independent Church, but that was purely a recommendation; and if you read it in connection with the Chattanooga plan, which that same General Conference said was both feasible and desirable, you will find that that plan was a plan, not for disseverance, but for the continuation of our colored brethren in a Regional Jurisdiction similar to every other jurisdiction in our Church. We have passed considerably from that, and I am not desiring to go back to it; but on this matter I protest, and as far as I am concerned I never will consent to it. I felt in entire accord with the statement made by Dr. Lamar the other day, but we reach an entirely opposite conclusion from them; and I never will consent, so far as I am concerned, to have anything done which distinctly looks to the formation of any other Church out of any unit of either of the Churches here. I hope to see the time when the colored brethren will all be in one Church with us, not in one Church outside of us, and when we can all work together for the good that we all desire to accomplish. I do not question the honesty or integrity of any man, but we are together as Christian brethren, and not as of those who on one day speak as we do and on another day speak otherwise.

Bishop Mouzon: I am glad that my friend Mr. Simpson made precisely the speech that he did make. "Great is thy faith." There are some of us who are even younger who have not faith to believe that in our lifetime, or in our children's lifetime, all differences between men shall be obliterated.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I do not either, but "a thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday."

Bishop Mouzon: I would have my good friend Mr. Simpson believe that there are some of us who love our fellow men as truly as some others, and that we are endeavoring to be as truly religious as some others. I would have him to believe, at least, that we are trying to be religious. We enjoy being preached to. But we do not appreciate being reminded continually that in the opinion of some we do not manifest Christian principle. Love may have different ways of showing itself. That is a matter of opinion—the ways in which love is to show itself. It is the belief of many of us that following this war you will be under the necessity of giving to the Churches in Europe certain rights and privileges that they have never had before, and I have heard that expression fall from the lips of more than one. It is the conviction of many of us that what we have been pleased to call race consciousness must be recognized. It is the conviction of many of us that in the minds and hearts of the colored people of America there is the manifest desire that they may be organized into a united and independent Church. It is also the opinion of many of us that it is altogether possible for one to deceive himself when he says that he is giving to his colored brother entire equality everywhere, when, as a matter of fact, he is not giving equality anywhere, any more than equality has been given to him in the Methodist Episcopal Church as it has been operating during my lifetime. We should deal candidly with ourselves. We believe that in the long run it will be better for the colored members to be in a separate Church, but we are not legislating for the long run now, except as what we do to-day will have some influence in the long run. It is desired and intended that these Central Conferences should become Jurisdictional General Conferences just as soon as possible, and we insist on the word "shall" and not "may." We do not agree at all to the amendment which our friend Mr. Simpson has offered. There we shall stand. But, my dear brethren, although we may not be able to see eye to eye touching many things, let us not raise any question at all as to whether or not we live in the atmosphere of the New Testament—whether or not we are sincere in our profession of love toward all mankind. I do in my heart of hearts love my colored brethren. I do, Mr. Simpson, and I go farther than many. I trust I go just as far as Jesus Christ would have me do. I believe that I do. And let me re-iterate: it is just a question of judgment and not a question of sincerity or motive or of piety.

A. F. Watkins: I do not suppose any member of this Joint Commission doubts or had from the beginning doubted that

the members from the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, would prefer that the colored Methodists of the United States should be in a separate General Conference. I suppose that was made clear from the very beginning of our negotiations as well as made clear by the declaration of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, at Oklahoma. That is unquestionable. That, however, does not represent the last point upon which the Southern Commissioners will stand. They may be mistaken about that. When Bishop Mouzon made that statement this morning, I wondered what he meant. I knew that theoretically that was the position which we preferred. I wondered if there were in the minds of any one of this company the thought that there had been an understanding among the Southern Commissioners that that was the thing for which we would try to work. If that is so, I disclaim any such understanding. I have never heard it expressed by any one that that was the understanding.

Bishop Mouzon: A question of privilege, if Dr. Watkins will permit it. There was no such intention on my part, and I disclaim it.

A. F. Watkins: I did not suggest that there was on the part of Bishop Mouzon. I said I wondered if his saying that had led anybody to believe that, and I say no; so far as I know, such a thought has never been suggested. I, for one—and I believe I stand for the brethren of the Southern Commission—am willing to go by the days, step by step, in the solution of this problem with an open mind ready to acknowledge, if the demonstration comes, that we were mistaken in insisting that there ought to be an entirely separate and independent ecclesiasticism, for I confess there has always been with me a very strong pull when a man says we need to get in closer relations with the negro than we have ever succeeded in getting with the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church—we may be mistaken about that, but there is no ulterior purpose on the part of the Southern Commission that this thing should be done. We are willing in perfect good faith—I speak for myself and those who have voted as I have—that there should be these Central Conferences represented as has been suggested in the General Conference, not in proportion to their numbers, but as expressive of the principle of representation in these Missionary Conferences, and then as far as the other matter is concerned, in the presence of God, let it take care of itself. With this sort of a disclaimer I would like to push out of the way that expression of Bishop Mouzon's, and I say I do not know what the other considerations may be which will require you to take your stand; but whatever they may be, we

have to be shown them, because we believe this is an essential matter.

W. N. Ainsworth: I simply want to move that the debate on this pending question be limited to five minutes, without restrictions as to the individual time, if I can get a second.

George Warren Brown: We do not live in Savannah.

T. N. Ivey: I do not know whether any one in this body has been keeping up with the editorials written by myself in the *Christian Advocate* on this question. I am sure, if there be such, they noticed, about a month ago, that my mind had undergone a certain change. Up to that time, I was firmly convinced that only an independent relation for our colored brethren would bring them into that large place which is absolutely necessary for them in order that they may achieve their destiny and have a "man's rights," to use the common expression. But since studying the relation of our Church to the colored brethren I came to the conclusion, and so expressed myself about three weeks ago, that what we Southern Commissioners should stand for, and what I came to stand for, should be exactly the same relation as our General Conference in 1866 had in mind. The object of that Conference was to have a separate jurisdiction and a separate General Conference for the colored brethren within the Church. The name of that Church was to be The Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, South. There was to be no absolutely independent organization, but a separate General Conference for our colored brethren in the Southern Methodist Church. I came to this meeting with that in mind. Honestly, I do not believe now that an entirely independent relation for our colored brethren would meet what we desire; and in accepting this Article VIII., the other day, I did so in the assurance that the time would come when the members of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church would come in, and with the colored members of the Methodist Episcopal Church form an entirely separate General Conference, yet within the reorganized Church, and not an independent Church as Brother Simpson has so expressed it. I do not know what the other brethren of the Southern Commission think, but I want it distinctly recorded that that is my view. That is where I stand, and I am willing to accept this limited representation of our colored brethren in the assurance that the time will come when this jurisdiction shall so increase as to become a separate General Conference and yet remain an integral part of the reorganized Church. I have felt it necessary to state my position on this subject.

George Warren Brown: I also was a member of the Committee of Eight, and that committee provided the word "shall" in the plan. We did discuss the question as to whether or

not we should use the word "may" or the word "shall." We thought as a basic principle that we would provide a way whereby the colored membership as well as all the other world groups might be given a Jurisdictional General Conference. We used the word "shall" because we had to decide upon some term to use, and that term was used tentatively to come before this body of Commissioners for discussion as we are doing here now. I myself believe that the word "may," from every standpoint, is more consistent and more psychological. I think the word "shall" suggests, just what has been expressed on this floor many times, that we are appearing to put them out. I myself believe in the Associate General Conference for the colored membership of our Church, to make the same a fair and integral part of the United Methodist Episcopal Church, so that it will have a foundation for drawing to it each of the other colored Methodist units, and thus we may have one great Church embracing all races. In fact, that is the plan which this world program provides for. If we use the word "may" instead of "shall," the same appears more brotherly in its effect and also suggests that we are leaving said action to them; that is, the leading thought I had in mind was that we would be elevating each of these racial groups which we have set out, including the colored membership of our Church, into a General Conference relation with all the autonomies that go with the same. Now, it goes without saying that the colored membership should consider that they would be distinctively advanced and not reduced, and it could not help but have that effect, without securing the advantages that would be provided by an Associate General Conference. It is certainly going to be a long way off before the colored membership of our Church becomes 600,000.

E. B. Chappell: It might not be.

George Warren Brown: We need not let that worry us very much right now, and there is every probability that the colored membership of our Church would want to take advantage of a position which would give them full autonomy long before they get the 600,000.

Claudius B. Spencer: I can speak my mind on this matter in a very brief time. We are a connectional Church. Our economy is such that we are at home anywhere wherever there is a lost soul to be led to Christ. Our economy is such that we can go in force to any part of this planet. We are the only Protestant Church that is connectional after a fashion, and it must be that that involves a certain responsibility as well as a great opportunity; and when I look on the story of other Churches like the Roman Catholic Church, when I think of the age that

the other religions have come to, the Buddhist for instance in India, I have a petition before God that I remember in the night season, and I pray upon my knees that this Church which has the particular endowments and characteristics may have the chance to exercise them for the well-being of mankind throughout the world, and when there is influence or capacity for an ecumenical Church with an ecumenical message it tries my heart that anything would separate us from that opportunity. I am the last man on earth to assume a pharisaical attitude and claim myself superior to the sons of Capers, because I differ from the position they have taken. But we are yet in the morning of time. We are yet far from the afternoon of the world. It seems to me that God in raising up John Wesley liberated a force out into the midst of mankind with diverse conditions to be the means of welding them together as no other ecclesiastical organization can, not even the Roman Catholic Church. And permit me to say that I see a future for these colored men. I have taken some little time and spent considerable money to try to fathom if I could what the negro man is and what he was back yonder where he came from. I have tried to study the story of these races of these empires and kingdoms which arose there, but which, on account of physical conditions, according to philosophers, were from the first doomed to the kind of record they have made. I have even gone so far as to talk with the most eminent Egyptologists in the world to see whether there was negro blood in the great builders of the pyramids. I can realize that we are determining a new chapter in the history of mankind. The thunders and horrors of the world war are writing the first pages of that new history and I hope—God knows I hope—that we may not separate from these tables and go out across the threshold of the door to this building with our hands withdrawn one from the other. I yet hope this next to the last day—I hope that some word will be found that will bind us together, and not only bind us together but bind together with us all the babbling tongues and colors of humanity. If we can do that, gentlemen of the Commission, we shall not have come in vain.

Bishop Mouzon: A question of personal privilege; and if you do not think it is a question of personal privilege, say so, and I will take my seat. Some words I used this morning have been so interpreted as to make me say what was not in my heart. It may be that I blundered in my extemporaneous speech and used words that did not give clear expression to what was in my mind to say. I am asking permission, therefore, to make perfectly clear what was in my heart and mind this morning. I do not recall the exact language that I used, but what I intended to say was that there were members of the Southern

Commission who were looking to the time when there should be an independent Church for our colored brethren. I supposed that everybody knew that already. I did say that some members of the Southern Commission had slowly come to the position which they now take—that is, agreeing to a limited representation from the Central Conferences in the General Conference because they hold that, by and by, doubtless the colored membership would of their own desire go into an independent Church. That is what I was endeavoring to say this morning. If you should ask me if I am entirely unwilling that the colored membership of the Church should continue down to the very last syllable of time associated with the reorganized Church, I answer, I am entirely willing that they should remain associated with the Church. Do you ask me what my own feeling is in the matter? If the going out of the colored people from the Church would in any way cause us to sympathize less with them, or to coöperate in a less brotherly spirit, or to do less for them, or in any sense to be less truly brothers to them than otherwise we would be, I would regret their being ever organized into a separate Church. I earnestly desire that all Methodism may get behind the work being done by our colored brethren, that together we may help them build themselves into a larger life and that together we may work for the upbuilding of the kingdom of God.

R. E. Jones: The prisoner at the bar would like just a word or two from experience. I am glad Bishop Mouzon made this last statement. I have never doubted his honesty nor his love; but, to be frank with you, I doubt if I ever can view this question now as I did prior to this meeting. To what purpose do you provide an Associate General Conference when you have no immediate membership to go into the Associate General Conference, whether the word be “may” or “shall”? You erect a house here. Where are the occupants of that house to come from? Is there not somewhere the thought that at some day that house will be erected, and we are preparing it now, putting doors in it and windows and turning on the lights, or if not to what other purpose, whether it is “may” or “shall”? Every time I see that chapter in the Discipline I shall know what it was intended for.

T. N. Ivey: What do you mean by that?

R. E. Jones: Some other statements were made this morning that need not be referred to. Brothers, we cannot be delivered to the same Church. The time has passed and gone, and the evening shades appear, when a man can contract a delivery of negroes. I will not be delivered, and if the negroes cannot be delivered it is all the more reason why I will not accept it. If we cannot meet squarely on that floor man for man

and make our own negotiations and agree, it cannot be done by proxy. Moreover, you queer the whole question of the union of our colored people, whatever your relations may be to the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, when in their absence you give them a place by preference, for, I am frank to express to you, what I am saying is entirely in the open—I will not stand for any proposition that alienates me from my own Church with which I am more closely associated than I am with the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, and I wonder if you realize just what our feeling and attitude are. Now, this whole “shall” is an interesting thing to me. I have a little of the evangelistic type, but I don’t know whether I could conduct a mourners’ bench or not, especially when I knew the more quickly I got in there the more quickly I would get out of the Church. Instead I would say, Stand still, and I would not invite the people to come forward. Instead of inviting them to come forward, I would not say, Come. I don’t like this question at all. It may be that I am wrong, but I got the impression this morning that even the representation allowed here was to be divided with our brothers of the C. M. E. Church, an intolerable proposition, absolutely intolerable. Is it wrong for me to think that way? You know my heart. I have been here with you these days, and I raise the question, For what purpose do you erect an Associate General Conference, whether with a “may” or with a “shall”?

Bishop Cranston: This is a good time to remind ourselves of God and of our experience with ourselves when trying to walk a straight line in our individual religious life. I take it that if we have learned anything as men seeking to serve God it is, first, that we cannot walk alone. And if we have learned another thing, it is that we cannot to-day anticipate all our needs for the morrow or plan with certainty to meet them, and that grace and wisdom must come to us as required by conditions as they develop. To answer first Brother Jones’s question, I observe that the more intimately related we are to any proposition, the more apt we are to consider ourselves the only factors involved in its application. But there are, besides the brethren of color in our own country, several other very important factors in this matter. We are endeavoring not only to provide for them in the present, but to anticipate their needs in the future growth of our Church through the success of its missionary operations. Our plans must contribute to the contentment of our Chinese membership and the membership in India and Europe and the Latin American countries. The negro is not by any means the only factor, nor perhaps the dominant factor in this matter, for the negro can hardly expect, in so

far as his relationship to the reorganized Church is concerned, to be so largely represented as we hope to see both China and India in a not far away time. So the fact is that this kind of a Conference as proposed is not a notification to our colored brethren that they are not wanted after they attain 600,000 members any more than it is to these other races. The plan is general and world-wide in its significance and promise. In the next place, inasmuch as we confess that we cannot manage ourselves, that we are not competent for self-direction, we are hardly competent to make provision for what has not yet transpired in the working out of God's providence except in so far as we may reasonably anticipate the fulfillment of God's promises. But, using the light given to us, the distance we have traveled since our Churches first entered upon these negotiations has been very great. We have made striking progress from the crude plan outlined by the Chattanooga agreement. This is because we are believing in each other more and more. We have gained faith in each other's integrity and good intentions. I am recognizing with heart and mind the difficulties confronting the brethren of the Church, South. I think they have come a great way in accepting what we call now the Jurisdictional General Conference, in accepting it with actual hope and expectancy of its good service; and if they can let this stand as it is, I shall be very glad. I think all we are doing is under God's care and the outcome will be safe. But they have to look back to a constituency that has not been over this course of reflection and prayer, and we have to look back to a constituency that has not come so long a way as we think we have come. It would not be safe in a public way to estimate the number of our people who would have to be conciliated by great effort to reconcile them for the sake of unification to the use of one or the other of these words in this place. We could create a sentiment antagonistic in either Church, but we are not going to do it, I trust. Knowing how soon a mother's love may become vicious if it leads her boy to be a slacker instead of a hero, I am simply holding to my faith in our colored people when I vote to turn their eyes toward the day when they shall be men, thinking, planning, and achieving for themselves; and yet, during the period of their development, free to enjoy the sympathetic recognition and helpful counsel of their white brethren, if they so desire. I believe that a large majority of our people will approve my course as in harmony with the divine order in the moral and intellectual development of every race and every individual. Moreover, I believe that our colored people will readily realize the beneficence of this arrangement as

soon as the dust raised by their vociferous politicians has settled down.

John M. Moore: I regret very much that some of our brethren in your Commission should get the idea that we are standing here because we want to thrust the negro out. It hurts me for you to get that idea, and it hurts me for Dr. Jones to feel that is why we have taken that position and why we are holding out simply to get rid of the negro. We have passed a long way from any such idea as that. We believe to-day that this is in reality the best thing for the negro, and I will say why. If I were a negro in your Church, I would choose very quickly the Jurisdictional General Conference. I want you to get my position. Now, what do the negroes lose in passing from this Central Conference to the Jurisdictional General Conference? If they lose anything else than the right to vote in the General Conference, the right of ten delegates to vote, I do not know what it is. They are there. They are the representatives of their brethren, and they can present all their interests. They have the rights to the floor. We have six members of our General Conference, representing six of our Conference units that we call Missions, that do not have the right to vote. Those six men will be in our General Conference in Atlanta, and they will take part in all our proceedings, but they cannot vote. Have we thrust them out? No. We have drawn them to us. They are representatives in deed and in truth. Now, you lose the right to vote and that is all; otherwise, so far as I can see, you have every other power that you would have in the Central Conference. Now, what do you gain? You come into the right to pass upon the constitution of the Church, you come into relationship with the general activities of the Church through its boards. You establish a General Conference of the same dignity as that which is possessed by the other Churches. It seems to me that you make a rapid stride in passing from a Central Conference into a Jurisdictional General Conference. That is the way I see it. Take the status of the two. The Central Conference opens its doors to the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church, to the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, with their million and a half members who have their General Conferences and who elect their bishops, and who have charge of the work of their Church. You say to them, Come into the Central Conference and get ten representatives with no right to the larger activities that you have in your General Conference. That is what you say through your Central Conference. If you say that the Central Conference is the best thing, that is what you would say to them—to come in under this relation—but if you take the Jurisdictional General Conference, you have all the

rights that the others have, you have the vital relation to the great Church, all its benefactions, and all that it can give will be poured into it. These are the two options; now which do we prefer? Do you want us to say, Hold on to the Central Conference? I say the Jurisdictional General Conference is far beyond anything that we can have in the Central Conference in its invitation to other people. Why do we advocate it? It keeps the door open for the other people. We are not here saying to the Colored Methodist people that they must come in, but we want the door so left open that if they want to come in they can come in under the provisions that we have made, and we also say that this is the largest sphere that we can see. More than that, by this provision you enlist anew the sympathy of that great group that is in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. There are two million of us, and 10,000,000 of white people are in sympathy with the great activities of this Church. You accept this and at once, as we go back, we enlist the sympathy of our people for this new relation and we can bring them and others to maintain a new service for colored people. We believe that the Jurisdictional General Conference is a great and blessed provision for the colored brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

John F. Goucher: We are making a grave mistake in attempting to discuss this question as applicable simply to our colored constituency. We are fixing our entire consideration on a particular under a general proposition as if it involved nothing but the colored constituency. I would be under compulsion to vote for "may" instead of "shall" because I dare not, as a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, say that any other members shall go out and make it mandatory and draw a distinction. They might as well say to you, Go out yourself. We have no right to do that, but I think we are very gravely mistaken in attempting to settle on that basis. To illustrate that point, I would say the instructions we have are very indefinite:

The Methodist Episcopal Church considers the plan outlined in the suggestions that were adopted by the Joint Commission representing the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Protestant Church, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and approved by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, with one modifying recommendation, as tentative, but nevertheless, as containing the basic principles of a genuine unification of the Methodist bodies in the United States, and especially of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, by the method of reorganization.

I read from the action of the Saratoga Convention. Again:

We also favor the unification of all or any Methodist bodies who accept this proposed plan after it has been accepted and perfected by both the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Episcopal Church.

That is, I understand our Commission was to arrange for the unification of Methodism under such plan as would reach the world problems and would make possible unification of all branches of Methodism. Therefore, I cannot see that we are justified in applying it to a part of Methodism only. I would say further that I look out on the foreign field and there is a tremendous passion in Eastern Asia for independence. In 1907 it was my privilege to be at the Centennial Conference at Shanghai, and the members of the Methodist Church were brought together. I have referred to it before. I think it should have special emphasis. From that time to this there have been committees and commissions and efforts made to unify the Methodists in that direction. If we write in the word "shall," we will forestall a tendency to eliminate themselves from Methodism—the different branches of Methodism. We will put on record that when they have attained a certain numerical strength they will come to a state very much larger than they could possibly acquire by asserting their independence before that time and two things will be the result. I think they are seriously needing considerable indoctrinating before they stand alone. If they separate themselves too soon, they cannot maintain a full Church life. They have not the numbers. When they attain to sufficient numerical strength, they will be sufficiently indoctrinated to attain unto this larger sphere. I think we are doing them a favor in holding them to loyalty, which is essential for them if they would establish themselves. The house is not being built for individuals, but for one inclusive Church. If I understand the tendency of our colored friends, it is for differentiation. In 1816 the African M. E. Church went out from the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1820 the same thing occurred with the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. In 1870 the same thing transpired with the Colored M. E. Church, and my judgment is not the expression of a desire on my part, but simply interpreting things by what I see—namely, there is going to be a unification of the Colored Methodists of the United States in the not distant future. If we say "shall," my judgment is that it will not hasten it in this country. I think it would be unfortunate in the case abroad; but be that as it may, I will say the differentiation of the colored people, not into an independent Church, but into organic federated relations or whatever relations you may call it, is according to the scientific trend of the time.

Bishop Cranston: I would like to ask a question. I was in China in 1907, and my recollection is that all the missionaries of the other Churches except our own were encouraging special independence.

John F. Goucher: Our own were in that same meeting, and sympathetic.

Bishop McDowell: I never coveted more the gift of concise speech and never coveted more the gift of kindly and gracious and specific speech. We are discussing this whole matter as we must, with three things in our mind. When we had up this morning the subject of representation, we had that subject up with this topic in our minds and with the later sentence in the report in our minds. Now that we have this part of it up we have in our minds all the time the other two features. We cannot separate them one from the other in our consciousness whatever we may do in our speech. We are discussing a proposition affecting the creation of a Jurisdictional General Conference all the time with a sentence on the next page which reads: "But said representatives shall not have the right to vote." That is to say, we are saying that when 600,000 persons become members of any one of these Central Conferences that Central Conference shall become a Jurisdictional General Conference and thereafter it shall be presented in the General Conference of the Church only by an embassy, a company of men authorized to speak upon the matters that pertain to them, but without the thing which we all feel to be an essential item of value in any representative body—namely, the right to vote as a representative. Now, that is not a small matter. You grant that it only means ten votes from one of these jurisdictions, nevertheless important matters have been decided in ecclesiastical and other bodies by ten votes. Nor does this involve simply, as has been stated here, the negro membership. It involves our whole foreign missionary adjustment, and I cannot persuade myself for one minute that we would increase our missionary power by saying to China and India and Europe and South America, with all of which countries we are to have tighter relations, that the minute the membership reaches 600,000 they shall cease to have a real representation in the General Conference of the Church which they have been invited to join. Now, I would not like to say a single word anywhere that would not be a proper word. I wish this wretched time limit were not on here for half a second—

Bishop Denny: I hope that the Chairman will not be able to look at his watch.

Bishop McDowell: Beloved brethren, it is my judgment, and by that I must stand or fall, that one of the essential ways by which you can help any backward person or race is by recognition quite as much as by sympathy and assistance. I would rather have them with us blundering and making votes that are not in accordance with wisdom than to have them detached from us. And I would have the bonds tightened within

the republic and without the republic against that day when the race struggles within the republic are going to be more intense than they have ever been and when the race adjustments outside of the republic have to be made as they have not yet been made. We have not had our great struggle between the yellow races and the white races. Now, please God, when the great struggle comes, as it must come, before the final civilization of the world is determined, we must not have a loose relation with China. We must have as tight a relation as we can possibly have, as close and influential a relation as we can possibly have, and, therefore, I could not get my own consent to say that when they come to be 600,000 strong they shall take a Jurisdictional General Conference with whatever powers are given to it and thereafter have no vote in that great centralizing, unifying, cohering body which represents this part of the Church of Jesus Christ, not in the Americas but in this part of the Church of Jesus Christ in the world.

J. H. Reynolds: I belong to that group of Southern men who believe that the colored man should be a part of our reunited Church, and I belong, I believe, to a growing number of Southern men who believe that. Those of us who entertain that view want an organic relationship with people of all classes in our Church that we may have a common platform on which we can meet in a Christian way in trying to promote the cause of the kingdom. I want us to remember in this connection the statement of Secretary Bryan when he was discussing with the Ambassador from Japan the points of difference between Japan and the United States. When the Japanese ambassador asked Secretary Bryan, "Is this the last word of the United States?" Mr. Bryan replied, "Between friends the last word is never said." And I wish, therefore, respectfully to suggest that in the presence of God and of the tremendous responsibilities resting upon us, no Commissioner here dare utter the last word. May I just in a few words in the limited time allowed me make a plea, that we shall let stand the report of the committee on two points? The first suggestion is that we should not disturb the fixed representation of these Central Conferences in the General Conference as reported by the committee. The second is that we shall let stand the introductory paragraph to Article VIII., just as it came from the committee. I submit in support of the last suggestion that the plan was worked out by a Committee of Eight representative men of this Commission, that they met under conditions that enabled them to throw everything on the table. They were not restrained by a consciousness that everything they said in the committee room was to be published to the world, but they were free to open their

souls and to throw on the table everything, and thus they brought to the problem the collective judgment and the collective good will as well as sound common sense of both the Churches. We are here in the open Commission laboring under the consciousness that we are speaking not to the people before us, but to all Methodism, and in a certain sense to the whole Christian world. In the next place, I wish you would let that stand because it represents a real compromise between the two views represented by the two Churches. The Southern Church came here through its Commissioners with the recommendation that the colored people should be set up into an independent Church organization. You people came here with the recommendation that the colored people remain an integral part of the Church. I submit that the plan that is before us represents a middle ground, and I think a happy middle ground. We have on the part of the Southern Commission accepted your position that the colored man shall be a member of the reunited Church, and that he shall be protected by the Constitution of that Church. We have insisted that he be erected into a separate General Conference, that the principle of separation which you people yourselves have in your Church—the principle of separate Conferences for the races—shall be extended on up to and including the General Conference. I believe we have a perfect right to stand here and insist that you should meet us there; but you met us with the suggestion that you could not carry your Church to that proposition all at once, and so we expressed a willingness to join you in building a bridge from your present position to that position, and the committee in bringing in the report before us has put two important timbers in that bridge: First, limited but real representation of these Central Conferences in the General Conference; second, another timber that we shall fix the conditions when they will pass from a Central Conference status to a Jurisdictional General Conference. That condition is 600,000 members, and I submit that the condition represents a reasonable condition. It represents a large membership. It represents a membership almost equal to the largest colored Methodist Church in the nation. We do not say that they shall constitute a separate General Conference Jurisdiction in four years or eight years or twenty years or a thousand years, because we do not know that your colored membership will ever reach 600,000; but we have submitted a reasonable number, that of 600,000, that represents a respectable Church. Let me further suggest in this connection, in considering limiting the representation, that the United States in dealing with Federal Territories occupied by the people of their own blood and bone, representing the same civilization and the same stage and cul-

ture, arranged that Territories be represented in the United States Congress by only one man, independent of the number of people in the territory, and that man too without a vote. May I also suggest that ten constitute a real representation, not with power by vote to protect themselves, but with power to represent adequately their ideals and interests before the highest tribunal of the Church, so that these interests and ideals may be duly considered in legislation pending.

Edwin M. Randall: There are certain propositions that to my mind are so fixed as to need no argument whatever. One is that on both sides we are a body of men whose sincerity and earnestness and candor are above question. Another is that we are all intensely interested in bringing about a unification of these two Churches. A third is that every one of us honestly desires the welfare of our colored brethren. Another is that we earnestly desire that the structure which we build here shall be one that will not only promote the glory of God in the homeland, but give us the very best contact possible with the whole world to do our part, the best that it is possible for us to do, in winning this whole world to Jesus Christ. And this question that we have before us touches upon these and other problems that enter into the whole matter that is before us. Now, as between these two words "may" and "shall": In the first place, I very gravely question whether we have the right to dictate to any who are members of the Church with all the rights of membership as to whether they shall occupy a relationship of one sort or another. To do so, it seems to me, is to remove in part their rights of membership, and it is a difference of degree and not of essential difference between that and excluding them from membership. In the second place, I feel that the mandatory form has within it a real menace as to the relationship between our Church and the colored work that we must maintain in order to do the best we can for them and what we ought to do for them, and I do not believe that we can afford to neglect anything that will help us to avoid the possibility of racial troubles that lie before us at home and internationally in the not distant future of the world. And that touches upon the remaining consideration that I have. I fear it not only imperils the relationship we ought to maintain in our work with the colored brothers, but the relationship we must maintain internationally with the other races to whom we must minister and with whom we shall work. And finally, I do not believe that in these and other matters it is necessary for us to limit ourselves in the future and to tie our hands for the future by mandatory arrangements. I have not any question in my heart but that we can freely and safely trust each other to meet the situations in the future as they may arise,

without tying our hands unnecessarily in the present. Whether it shall be within our lifetime and we shall enter personally into the adjustment of affairs growing out of such a situation as this or whether it will be for our children, I believe we can hereafter work together honestly and sincerely in good faith with an eye single to the glory of God and that undoubtedly, in the presence of the situations that shall arise and that we cannot foresee at this time, we can meet them more wisely than we can provide for them in a definite manner at the present time.

H. M. Du Bose: I can make my statement in brief words. Recommendation D of the action of the Saratoga General Conference reads:

That, conforming to the suggestion of the Joint Commission, the colored membership of the reorganized Church be constituted into one or more Quadrennial or Jurisdictional Conferences.

The recommendation of the Southern General Conference was that it was to be "an independent organization." We are simply conforming to the idea of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this arrangement. In point of fact, with a few modifications that have been applied, we are conforming to the letter of it. We have journeyed a good way from the literal recommendations of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. That was a recommendation that there should be an independent or Jurisdictional General Conference. The modification makes it somewhat different in character, yet gives it larger powers and prerogatives than it would have had if it had remained simply as a Quadrennial Conference in the original state of this idea of the Commission. My other statement is this, that in passing the colored membership from this somewhat subsidiary relation—and it is a subsidiary relation as compared with the ideal of the General Conference at Saratoga; I mean the Central Regional Conference is a subordinate idea as compared with that which was in the Conference recommendations, as I infer them; but in passing the colored membership from this subsidiary or subordinate Central Conference into the Jurisdictional Conference, we not only more completely fulfill the ideal of this recommendation of the South, but we do not in any wise put these brethren out of the Church, or pass them from any relationship in the Church. We mistake and confuse our own thinking and the sincerity of our own motives when we imagine that we are putting them out of the Church, or are opening a way to put them out of the Church. These two points are in my mind, and I think both are well taken. I am sure of the first, and I think I am of the latter, as well.

I. Garland Penn: As most of you brothers know, I came here

from a sanitarium, and it has been with some difficulty that I have been able to follow closely the discussions. I have not been able to sleep well at night, because my people have been under discussion for these days and the situation has changed radically since I made my address the other day, and I wish to put on record this statement: Since the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, is to meet in May of this year, as one of the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, representing particularly the negro race, I sincerely desired that we should reach an agreement at this meeting concerning the status of the negro in the proposed reorganized Church, so that it might be incorporated in any plan which might be agreed upon and forwarded to the General Conferences of the two Churches. I also desired to make such a contribution to that agreement as would eliminate all reference hereafter to the negro as remotely responsible for the failure of the Churches to unify. I, therefore, without consulting the people whose rights were involved, agreed to stand personally for a reduction in their representation in the General Conference in lieu of what appears to be larger opportunities, privileges, and powers in the Central Conference of the colored jurisdiction. This concession I made in my address delivered on Tuesday, January 29, was after much thinking and prayer, and if approved by my people was to my mind one of the greatest single contributions yet made to the much desired unification of the two branches of American Methodism. Conditions have changed radically since this conclusion was made, and now it appears that what was intended to be a great contribution upon the negro's part to unification, in which he sincerely desires to be a part, may be in a few years the means of his complete elimination from any relation to the reorganized Church. To mention specifically, I wish to record that the proposal to limit his representation to a fixed number of ten, the further proposal to unite the members of the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church to become a part of the Central Conference of colored people and, therefore, share a portion of the very small representation in the General Conference accorded the negro, and the still further mandatory proposal that the Central Conference of the colored jurisdiction shall become an Associate General Conference, after the lapse of a few years, have changed the course of my thinking and release me from any obligations entered into by the willingness to a reduction of representation as expressed in my address. I may add that since the future of the negroes in the Methodist Episcopal Church is involved, as no other part of the membership of either Church, it seems to me that the members of the race in the Commission should not longer be ignorant of what their

people would desire, and as one of these Commissioners I shall seek this information of at least leaders of our Conferences before the next session of the Commission, if such be held.

Charles A. Pollock: For eight years I have lived under a territorial form of government in the Territory of Dakota. As I look over this body I think I do not see any one, with the possible exception of my friend across the way, that has enjoyed that same privilege.

Edwin M. Randall: Are you referring to me?

Charles A. Pollock: Yes.

Edwin M. Randall: I never did.

Charles A. Pollock: Then I have enjoyed a distinction had by no one else in this body. For eight years the President of the United States nominated all territorial officers—judges, governors, and all the other territorial officers. We were exceedingly restive under that condition. In those old days we used to hold conventions every year and declare that if the United States did not take us in, we had, with our 152,000 square miles of area, sufficient territory to open it up and take in the United States. We were always seeking for recognition, for more power; and finally it resulted, as you know, in a demand upon the part of the people of North Dakota that we be admitted. You know further that in 1889 Congress divided the territory and admitted both North and South Dakota into the Union. We wanted to come in under two conditions. First, we wanted to have local self-government with all that means; and, second, we were perfectly willing to be governed by the constitution and laws of the United States, but we wanted representation in the Congress of the United States, and we did not want that to be taken from us. Now, with these feelings and knowing what they were, I come to this question: I feel, Mr. Chairman, that if the word “may” in the section could be used instead of “shall” the persons who are affected will seek to have the largest possible power in their individual statehood, if I may use that expression as applying to the Central Conference or the Jurisdictional General Conference or whatever it may be called, but I would not think that they ought to be deprived of at least some representation in that great connecting body which brings the whole Church together. I think we are taking counsel of our fears somewhat. I have a feeling that this is a matter that will take care of itself. If a clause further along, as Bishop McDowell says, gave the right of these people to vote in the General Conference, there would not be the strenuous objection to the use of the word “shall.” Bishop McDowell has correctly said that this question is presented in three parts. It is very difficult to consider it alone. I like the words quoted from

Mr. Bryan. Gentlemen, there is no last word between friends. And I do not want to leave here to-morrow night without having joined hands with you men in making some disposition by which this great Church shall be united. If the time has come when we think we must say no, let us pause a moment before we say it.

H. M. Du Bose: I move that this question be referred to the Committee of Conference.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): I had recognized Dr. Downey.

David G. Downey: I want to propose an amendment to the amendment, which will help in the solution, if some one will second it.

Edgar Blake: I will second it.

David G. Downey: I move to amend by inserting after the words "full connection," in the next to the last line, "by a similar vote of the several Annual and Missionary Conferences and Missions of its jurisdiction, and without the approval of the General Conference, may become a Jurisdictional General Conference," etc., so that the whole section will read:

Any Central Conference by a majority vote of its members present and voting, with the concurrence of a majority of the several members of the Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions of its jurisdiction, present and voting, and with the approval of the General Conference, may become an Associate General Conference; and when it has 600,000 Church members in full connection, by a similar vote of the several Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions of its jurisdiction, and without the approval of the General Conference, may become a Jurisdictional General Conference with the privileges and powers herein provided.

Edgar Blake: I second the amendment.

David G. Downey: It has been argued here by Dr. Moore that if he were of any of these Central Conferences he would choose the jurisdictional form. I think that is quite probably true. But the point I make is that this preamble in its present form does not give to any Central Conference power of free choice. The first point is that by a majority vote of the members of the several Annual Conferences, Mission Conferences, and Missions, present and voting, and with the approval of the General Conference in which body each Central Conference has only a representation of ten, the Central Conference may become a Jurisdictional General Conference. Now, that is not free choice. Then it says, "And when it has 600,000 Church members in full connection it shall become"—that is not free choice, so that in the preamble as now stated there is no power of free choice. The amendment to the amendment which I have provided does give the power of free choice because it permits them when they have obtained 600,000 members, without the approval of the Gen-

eral Conference, to choose a Jurisdictional General Conference. If I understood Dr. Goucher's argument, it was that the use of the word "shall" will help to keep back the rising tide of unrest in our foreign fields, because they are striving to get recognition and independence too soon, and they ought to be restrained and would be restrained if they realized that when they have 600,000 they have to become partially independent. The point I make is that the permission granted to them meets that point, and it also obviates the somewhat discriminating idea of *shall* and of *command*. These Central Conferences in the foreign fields reaching this would say, "We should like to become a Jurisdictional General Conference," but even before they come to the 600,000 they may vote upon it, but cannot so become without the approval of the General Conference; but when they come to 600,000, then of their own choice they may have the independence they desire and the permissive idea will appeal to them, I believe, much more strongly than the mandatory. Then I believe the adoption of this amendment to the amendment or some such similar amendment will make possible the final adoption of this plan that we are preparing. I suppose we are not preparing a plan here that we hope will be rejected. We are here preparing a plan that we hope will really meet the favor and receive the approval of our General and Annual Conferences. Now, I call attention to the fact that in its present form if any one wanted to be captious and critical—and having lived in the atmosphere of this Commission for weeks, we know there will be captious critics looking for an opportunity to defeat what we do. What will they say? They will say, "In the preamble to Article VIII. you have a permissive plan for them to go out. You make one suggestion to these Central Conferences to leave us or to go into some other relation, and then in the second part you give them a second invitation or suggestion that they had better set up for themselves; and then, that there may be no doubt in their minds, you turn to the recommendation and say, "We recommend the adoption of this Constitution," and immediately following the adoption or within four years they shall then take a vote as to whether they shall stay in or go out. That is suggestion No. 3; and then (while I do not say it was in the minds of the Committee of Eight) that recommendation No. 2 is simply an opportunity to bring in other negro members, so that speedily the 600,000 will be reached, and they will have to go in another direction. Now, when you take away the "shall" and make it permissive, you take the sting out of this ulterior suggestion that will be made, and so it seems to me that there is here a chance to yield one of the three points of difference. In the one instance it is a question of static representation in the General

Conference or of a little more flexibility; in the other instance we have the question of "may" or "shall," and then the third as to whether the representation from the Jurisdictional Conferences in the General Conference shall be an embassy or a real delegation. Here are three points of difference. I do not believe that if either Commission stands absolutely pat on those three we can get together, but if there is some modification in one or two of them we may be able to get together on the others.

Abram W. Harris: I am not now thinking of the negroes, or of any great army of other Methodists, present or future, but only of ourselves here in this room, and in few words I will appeal to these Christian gentlemen of the South on behalf of these other Christian gentlemen from the North. All that the word "shall" compels is yet possible under the word "may," and if there be "a divinity that shapes our end," then the same result will be reached under "may," if the result be right. In the back of my mind there lies hidden a fairy tale of a naughty little boy who when he talked emitted frogs from his mouth, but his good little sister when she talked dropped pearls from her mouth. There is a difference between "shall" and "may." Some years ago when spending a little time in a Paris hotel as the guest of a friend we came down to dinner to find two dining rooms: one bright with light and gay with the music of a great orchestra; the other quiet and homelike. We chose the quiet room and asked the usher to seat us there. He replied, "You must go there. It is for those not in evening dress." Then the quiet room no longer attracted us. We would rather have been where the loud band was, because of that ugly frog-word, "must." You of the South have been generous; I think I tell no secret when I say that you have come farther in some matters than we expected. But we wish you could come just a little farther, to our help. Browning says:

"O the little more, and how much it is!
And the little less, and what worlds away!"

But when I ask you to yield a little more, you ask why we don't give the little more ourselves. There is this difference: You may not see it, but for us 'of the North there is a serious thing in the word "must." To us it seems to involve a matter of honor. And if in your wisdom you decide that you are not able to do it, so far as I am concerned, unification shall not fail; and if I run a big risk in saying this, I intend to risk it.

"There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries."

Upon the swelling sea the bark, One Methodism, is now afloat; and we must take the tide while it serves, or lose our venture. Unification rides on a full tide now that may not come again for a long, long time. We ought to put the ship over the bar while the water is deep. I am going with you. We have been apart five and seventy years, not by reason of what has been happening in these years, but because of something that happened seventy-five years ago. Shall we now further continue separation for fear of something in the future? Let us resolve, both sides, that whether we get all or less, we will join forces, and under Him who orders our way we will work out our salvation together. Let us write a big "MAY"; let us reject the offensive "MUST," and trust Providence to determine wisely some things that we are not able to determine here in the Parish House of the Independent Presbyterian Church of Savannah. Let us trust each other and Him, in full confidence that,

"Away down the river,
A hundred miles or more,
Other little children
Will bring our boats ashore."

H. M. Du Bose: I renew my motion that this matter be referred to the Committee of Conference and that we instruct them to report it at the session in the morning.

The motion was seconded.

A. F. Watkins: I want to extend thanks to Dr. Harris for having put a sweet taste in our mouths.

Bishop Denny: I hope that motion will not be adopted. It does not make for speed, but for delay. It does not settle one single question, nor does it propose, as I understand it, a possible settlement. Let us look at the amendment. I did not expect to speak until that motion was renewed. We have before us, in addition to the amendment to the amendment offered by Dr. Downey, the original amendment offered by Brother Simpson, which last amendment is to strike out the last four words in the fourth line and all the words in the fifth line down through "Conference." There are the words: "And when it has 600,000 Church members in full connection it shall become a Jurisdictional General Conference." That is the motion of Brother Simpson to which Brother Downey offered an amendment. How did this question come before us? After long discussion through more than one session Judge Rogers offered these words, and said that he proposed now that there should not be left an option, but that there should be a necessity for certain action. I think that fairly represents him. If I could, I should be glad to quote his exact words. He went farther and told us that this was

within the constitution of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and it is for you to say what his standing is as a man equipped to construe that constitution. I may say, on our side, we have understood that he is one of the experts on that subject, and I listened to him with the very greatest interest when he said that he offered a solution of the difficulty before us. That matter was referred to a Committee of Eight, four from the Methodist Episcopal Church and four from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and that Committee of Eight came back with the unanimous report for these words, carrying, as I understood it, the very suggestion or purpose of Judge Rogers that this should not be an optional matter, but a matter of necessity. Then we had our separate committee meetings, and while I am sorry any question arose that looked to binding the delegations, and while I confess I did not understand this to be conditional, yet it did not seem wise for me to raise a question, and you brethren came in with a conditional acceptance of this report, leaving every man free, however, to offer any amendment that he might desire to offer, which I understand left every man free on both sides of this Joint Commission. Now, in the light of those facts, what are we to gain by referring it to the Committee on Conference? We are simply wasting time without any probability that there will come out of this anything that we can deal with. We are now with all this matter practically before the Committee of the Whole and they want it to go back into another committee, and I don't see that we shall make any headway. I believe the only thing to do is to speak out what is in our minds and come to a vote, and I hope that the motion to refer will not prevail.

Abram W. Harris: I have been asked by some members of the Northern Commission to report, as Secretary, the fact that Judge Rogers presented that paper in the meeting of the Northern Commissioners, and they declined not only to approve, but to even vote upon it at all, and it was, therefore, personally presented by the Judge.

Bishop Denny: I understood it was personally presented by the Judge.

George Warren Brown: I suppose this motion was made, based upon the plan used in Congress, that when the Senate and the House fail to agree they refer the matter to a Committee of Conference and thereby arrive at the point of getting together.

John F. Goucher: I have heard the remark that there are three items here which necessarily are definitely related to each other. One has been referred to the Committee of Conference, and the motion before us is to refer a second one to the Committee of Conference, and I want to amend that by moving that we also refer to the Committee of Conference the third item

—namely, the second paragraph of Subsection 3 at the top of page 4, reading:

And the General Conference may elect not exceeding five ministerial and five lay representatives to a Central Conference, and said representatives shall be entitled to speak on all distinctively connectional matters, but they shall not have a right to vote in the Central Conference.

I move that that item, along with the one now under consideration, go to the Committee of Conference with the other one already referred to them, that they may make a report in the morning.

H. M. Du Bose: I do not at all object.

Rolla V Watt: I favor the motion to refer simply for this reason, that we are late now. It is nearly six o'clock, and we have never been very successful in evening meetings, and I question whether it would be good policy after a long day to come here and try to discuss this difficult question to-night, and the committee don't get tired. They can work all night and bring it in, and when we are fresh in the morning and they have made their report, we will not lose much time on it. I trust the motion will prevail.

A. J. Lamar: I favor Bishop Denny's position to vote against the motion of Dr. Du Bose, for the reason that it will not advance us one whit to-morrow morning. That committee will sit up all night and probably until a late hour and talk about this and bring in a report and that report will bring the matter before you to-morrow morning, and, regardless of what the committee reports, we will go on and consider it just the same as we are doing now. We have to talk it out in the Joint Commission, and we have to vote on it, in my judgment, before we can go any further, because all you have done and all you propose to do comes to nought unless you settle this question, and we have got to do the talking here at last. Why have the committee worry with it all night to no purpose and to no effect?

Charles A. Pollock: They might get better language.

A. J. Lamar: They won't get language satisfactory to both sides. It is not a question of language. It is a fundamental thing, and there is no use of dodging it. You may camouflage as much as you please, but we might as well lay all that aside and look right at this question as it stands. "Shall the negro have representation in the General Conference, however small, perpetually, or at his option, or shall the negro have that representation in the General Conference with the explicit provision that that representation shall cease at a certain time in a certain juncture of events? That is the question and that is all there is in it. Now, for myself, personally, as one of your members from the South, when I consented to forsake the suggestion of my General

Conference for a separate organization, and to accept the representation of the negro in the General Conference at all, I took the very farthest step that I could take, and I would not represent my people if I went farther than that. You gentlemen speak about the difficulty of carrying it through your Church. Well, we have the same difficulty. It will be a powerful appeal to the people of the Southern Methodist Church, it will be an answer to the inevitable criticism we shall hear among our Conferences and among our people—it will be a powerful influence to be able to answer them that this arrangement is necessarily temporary, we have arranged that it shall exist, but it shall be terminated at a definite period in the future when our colored membership shall have attained the number of 600,000. We might as well face the essential question, brethren. I believe in sentiment. I am a sentimental man. I enjoy it. I agree that sentiment is one of the great influences that shape the course of human history, but I believe that this Commission in dealing with the question of uniting these two great Churches into one and building a constitution for them has more need for common sense than for sentiment.

A. F. Watkins: I favor much the motion to refer to the committee. I do so appreciating all that has been said by Bishop Denny and Dr. Lamar with reference to the waste of time. But I respectfully submit that it is now quite a half hour after our usual time and we ought to adjourn. The committee will report in the morning the first thing and there will not be any time lost.

A. J. Lamar: Leave it right where it is in the morning.

A. F. Watkins: What is the objection to having the committee consider it? They cannot do any harm if they can't do any good. I greatly indorse the proposition to refer, so that we can see if they can't get together.

J. H. Reynolds: I favor the motion to refer. Our good friend Brother Lamar has said that we have reached an *impasse*—

A. J. Lamar: I have not said anything of the sort. [Laughter.]

J. H. Reynolds: Whether you said it or not, others have said it. That is just a condition that gives an opportunity to the committee to help us out. God has been working through the committee of this body and might He not work with that committee to-night?

Edgar Blake: I do not care about indulging in the gloomy forebodings of Dr. Lamar and Bishop Denny. Brethren, I believe, however far apart Christian men may appear to be, God has a common meeting ground for them somewhere. That is the way of the kingdom of Christ. If we have arrived at a time when men have closed their minds to any further light, there is nothing to be gained by delay; but I submit there is not

a man here who is willing to say that he has closed his mind to any light that may yet break. More than that, if the time has come when we are to deliver an ultimatum, we do not need to proceed any further. Now, there are three points of difference. It is a matter of some delicacy on my part to speak on this question, as I am a member of the Committee of Conference, but my confidence in the good judgment of my associates on the committee is such that I believe we can find some solution of the question that is before us. That is my belief, and no break should come until we have exhausted our utmost means to find a way to avoid it. I believe that a way is possible, and I certainly hope that the motion to refer this matter will carry.

Charles A. Pollock: I move the previous question.

Edgar Blake: All right, I will yield the floor for that.

Bishop McDowell: A point of order: Judge Pollock didn't have the floor to make that motion.

Charles A. Pollock: Am I recognized now?

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): Yes.

Charles A. Pollock: Then, to save any question, I now move the previous question.

A. J. Lamar: I second the motion.

A vote being taken, the motion was carried.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I want to rise to a question of personal privilege. I am a little in doubt, like Bishop Mouzon, whether it would be so considered, but it simply goes without saying that I, in conjunction with every other member of the Church, North, with whom I have talked, accept Bishop Mouzon's statement at full value without question.

Rolla V. Watt: I move that we vote on this question not later than 10:30 to-morrow morning.

A. J. Lamar: I second the motion.

Edgar Blake: What question?

Rolla V. Watt: The matter we have been discussing.

Edgar Blake: We have been discussing two or three matters.

Rolla V. Watt: I will withdraw the motion then, if we don't know what is before us.

Bishop McDowell: I move that we adjourn.

The motion was seconded, put to a vote, carried, and the Commission was dismissed with benediction by Bishop Collins Denny.

THIRTEENTH DAY, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1918.

MORNING SESSION.

The Commission was called to order by Bishop Earl Cranston. The hymn, "Jesus, Lover of my soul," was sung.

Prayer was offered by Bishop Frederick D. Leete.

The hymn, "Come, thou almighty King," was sung, and prayer was offered by Dr. Wallace, also by Bishops Denny and McDowell.

The hymn, "Nearer, my God, to thee," was sung.

The minutes of the last session were read and approved.

The roll was called and the following were present: Bishops Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke, Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon. Ministers: Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. J. Wallace, C. M. Stuart, F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar. Laymen: G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock, H. N. Snyder, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves.

Bishop Collins Denny took the chair as presiding officer.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The status is the consideration of Article VIII. under the title of Jurisdictional General Conferences to which an amendment was offered by Brother Simpson to strike out the words in the fourth line, and an amendment to that amendment was offered by Brother Downey, which was read, and that preamble, together with other related matters, was referred to the Committee of Conference, and it is now proper to call for a report from the Committee of Conference.

Bishop Mouzon: I rise to a question of personal privilege. On yesterday afternoon I listened with painful surprise to the interpretation placed on certain remarks of mine made at the morning session. My pain and surprise were so great that I was not able at that time to make full explanation. I crave, therefore, the privilege of presenting the following paper:

Since certain statements made by me have led to serious misapprehension on the part of the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church concerning the attitude of the Southern Commissioners touching the status of the colored man in the reorganized Church, it becomes my duty in words which cannot be misunderstood to make plain our views.

We greatly desire the unification of American Methodism—not as an end in itself, but as contributing to the unity of the nation and the unity of the race, and thus to the building up of the kingdom of God.

We feel deeply that a more cordial relation should exist between white people and colored people. We view with genuine concern the widening breach between the two races. We recognize that the people of the South should do vastly more than they have done for the welfare of these people with whom we are so closely associated. Whether or not unification is consummated, we Southern Methodists propose to increase our financial contributions and to give larger personal service to our brother in black.

In the plan proposed by the Committee of Eight we welcome an opportunity to join with our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church in a service which we believe can be best rendered by a united Methodism.

In all sincerity, without any mental reservation, and with no ulterior motives, we stand ready to join you on that platform.

If unification fails, we shall say to those who sent us here and to the Methodists of America: We met our Northern brethren halfway; we surrendered our original conception of the Regional Conference; we yielded the principle of representation for the colored man in the General Conference—and this because we desired unification and because we desired a closer relation to the colored people of America.

It has been the view of many of us that an independent Church was best for the colored man, as giving him a better chance to work out his own salvation and as the only way whereby to hold out any hope for the unification of the various bodies of colored Methodists.

In insisting that when the membership of a Central Conference shall reach 600,000 such Central Conference "shall become a Jurisdictional General Conference," we at no time thought of getting rid of any people whom we did not want; but rather of giving larger opportunities and more unrestricted privileges to people now ready to pass from their minority to their majority—to be no longer children under the care of guardians, but rather full-grown brothers in the one undivided Methodist family.

I am unwilling that Dr. Jones or Dr. Penn, and the other members of the Methodist Episcopal Commission, should present any paper, or take any steps, or cast any vote under the shadow of a complete misunderstanding of extemporaneous speech which was unfortunate in its phraseology and confessedly capable of the construction which has been placed on it.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): For the purpose of clearness, is that presented from the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, or is it a personal presentation?

Bishop Mouzon: I rose to a question of personal privilege, and I presented it myself personally, and as presenting my own views and as interpreting the views of those associated with me.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I knew that, but I thought the statement shows that while the statement was plural it came from you personally.

Bishop Leete: Then, we understand that this paper is not presented to us by the delegates of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, as a body?

Bishop Mouzon: The Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, were not aware of the fact that I was going to present that paper.

Bishop Leete: I am glad to know that. I am frank to say that from the phraseology it might be thought that it did come from the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, as a body, in which event it might be necessary for us to respond to that as a body; but if it comes solely from Bishop Mouzon, as an expression of his views of the feeling of the brethren, that is a matter that is personal solely.

Bishop McDowell: There was a single sentence just used, that he presented this under a question of personal privilege, but as "interpreting the views of those associated with me." I understand, therefore, it is not simply a personal statement, but is an interpretation as well of the statement of others.

Bishop Mouzon: If you please, it is my personal interpretation of the views of a large majority of the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Bishop McDowell: I only wanted that Bishop Mouzon's meaning should be entirely without question.

E. B. Chappell: Would it be well for us to have a motion as to the order of procedure for the day looking to a completion of the report? I want to throw this out as a suggestion before we begin. We should try to get something definite to say to our respective General Conferences, and not leave here in confusion with nothing to report. I shall favor a motion like this: That after finishing the report under consideration we take up the reports of other committees in order, and we consider them as far as possible, and that we agree to transmit these reports as they may be amended in full to our respective General Conferences, indicating the points upon which we fail to take action for lack of time and the points, if there are such, upon which we failed to agree. It seems to me an order like that ought to be adopted for our procedure to-day.

Edgar Blake: Dr. Chappell makes no motion.

E. B. Chappell: No, I threw that out as a suggestion if it is deemed worth while by our body

Edgar Blake: I would make the suggestion that we are very prodigal of our time in speeches, and I would like to proceed with the matter before us and get through. The Committee of Conference is ready to report.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): If it is the pleasure of the Joint Commission, we will hear the report.

Edgar Blake: We have reached the following agreement on the status of the bishops elected by or for the Central Conference Jurisdictions. We recommend that the following words be inserted at the close of the first paragraph of Section 4 of Article VII.: "The privileges, powers, and duties of the bishops elected by a Central Conference shall be limited to that Jurisdiction." So that the paragraph, as amended, will read:

Subject to the restrictions and limitations of this Constitution and to the rules and regulations adopted by the General Conference in relation to the connexional affairs of the Church, each Central Conference having not less than 150,000 Church members in full connection shall have authority to legislate regarding the distinctively regional affairs of its area, and to elect from time to time the number of bishops allotted to it by the

General Conference, subject, however, to their confirmation by the General Conference, and to their consecration by the general superintendents. The privileges, powers, and duties of bishops elected by a Central Conference shall be limited to that jurisdiction.

Bishop Leete: I wish we might have the entire report of the Committee of Conference before us before we act on any part.

Edgar Blake: We further recommend that Subsection 5 under Section 2 of Article VIII. be made to read as follows:

(5) To define and fix the powers of the Central Conferences, including their boundaries, and to elect and assign bishops to the same, except as otherwise provided.

You have provided elsewhere that a Central Conference having 150,000 or more members shall elect their bishops subject to confirmation by the General Conference. We recommend that Subsection 7 of Section 2, under the "Powers of the General Conference," be amended by having the following words inserted in the eighth line after the word "elected": "Or to the Central Conference Jurisdiction for which he was elected." So that the entire clause will read:

And provided, further, that a bishop shall be assigned for residential supervision to the Regional Jurisdiction by which he was elected or to the Central Conference Jurisdiction for which he was elected; but any bishop may be assigned by the general superintendents to any Annual Conference for presidential supervision if a majority of the resident bishops of the jurisdiction to which he was appointed shall concur in the appointment.

The purpose is to make clear that the general superintendents shall have the power to assign a bishop elected by the General Conference for a Central Conference Jurisdiction to any Annual Conference under the limitations provided herein. We also recommend further that in the first line the words "Regional Conferences" be stricken out and the word "Jurisdictional" substituted, and that the following be inserted at the close of the paragraph: "But the consent of the Central Conference delegation shall not be necessary to the assignment or transfer of a bishop to or from a Central Conference Jurisdiction." So that the entire clause will read:

And provided still further that the General Conference may assign a bishop to residence within any jurisdiction with the consent of the delegates of the jurisdiction from which he is to be assigned, but the consent of the Central Conference delegation shall not be necessary to the assignment or transfer of a bishop to or from a Central Conference Jurisdiction.

This gives the General Conference the power to take a bishop like Bashford and to assign him to another jurisdiction without

the consent of the delegates of the Central Jurisdiction from which he is taken or to which he may be assigned.

Bishop McDowell: I do not think the illustration is quite happy. Bishop Bashford is a general superintendent. Would it not be better for the purposes of your illustration to take a bishop like Bishop Johnson or Bishop John W. Robinson?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Suppose a bishop from India is elected for that Central Conference, provided that he had the consent of the Conferences on the Pacific slope to reside in that jurisdiction, would it be legal to transfer him there for presidential purposes?

Edgar Blake: If he is a bishop elected by the General Conference for Southern Asia, the general superintendents have the right to assign him for presidential purposes over any Annual Conference within any jurisdiction, provided that the bishops of that jurisdiction to which he is assigned for residential purposes consent.

Frank M. Thomas: Elected by the jurisdictions?

Edgar Blake: No; if he were elected by the General Conference. The privileges and powers are confined to that. In other words, a bishop elected by a Central Jurisdiction is limited to that jurisdiction, but a bishop elected by the General Conference is a bishop anywhere and everywhere.

David G. Downey: I understand that all the bishops are elected either by the Regional Conferences or by the Central Conferences.

Rolla V. Watt: Except where they are less than 150,000.

David G. Downey: Except where they are less than 150,000, and then they are elected by the General Conference.

Edgar Blake: Yes.

David G. Downey: And are they the only ones restricted?

Edgar Blake: The men elected by the General Conference are elected as general superintendents, and the men elected by the Central Conference are restricted to that Conference.

David G. Downey: I cannot quite see the force of the thing. If the whole matter were before me, I think I could.

Edgar Blake: When we come to the consideration of it, it can be explained.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Will you be kind enough to say what is to be added to Subsection 7?

Edgar Blake: "But the consent of the Central Conference delegation shall not be necessary to the assignment or transfer of a bishop to or from a Central Conference Jurisdiction." On the following matters your committee has been unable to reach an agreement: (1) Representation of the Central Conference in the General Conference; (2) The time and method by

which the Central Conference may become a Jurisdictional Conference; (3) The status of the representatives of the Jurisdictional Conference in the General Conference. Now, if you please, I move you that the following be inserted after the first paragraph of Section 4: "The privileges, powers, and duties of a bishop elected by a Central Conference shall be limited to that jurisdiction."

The motion was seconded.

Bishop Cooke: It would seem that much explanation of this would be necessary to a clear understanding of it. We have two classes of bishops; one elected by the Central Conference and the other by the General Conference. Those elected by the Central Conference are restricted in their episcopal functions to those Central Conference Jurisdictions. Those elected by the General Conference become general superintendents. That seems to be having the lesser to govern the greater, inasmuch as those elected by the General Conference represent only that fragment of the Church less than 150,000. Now, of course it is very evident, if such is the case, that there is no such thing any longer in the larger sense as a general superintendency which shall have the powers assigned to it here in this Subsection 7. A bishop may be assigned by the general superintendents to an Annual Conference for presidential supervision, but there are no general superintendents to make the assignment. The bishops are assigned to the Central Jurisdictions. How are those bishops in the Central Jurisdictions to make an assignment of the bishops to their jurisdictions? You have no authority there. You have no right and no power to assign any bishop outside of his own jurisdiction to function in any other jurisdiction; and if, on the other hand, it is meant otherwise that the general superintendents shall do it here, you have a bishop who for distinction's sake can be called a missionary bishop assigning bishops to preside over Annual Conferences. It seems to me, when we go down into this, it is not clear, that it does need explanation resulting from the breaking up of this general superintendency in Methodism, and the making of it a purely diocesan episcopacy. If that is the case, it ought not to be simply left to inference and to deduction from what is printed here, but it should be clearly stated so that there shall be no misunderstanding in the Annual Conferences or among our preachers. If the bishops are confined to their Central Jurisdictions (and they have been anything here to the contrary), with no power whatever to do what you say they can do, then assign a bishop to an Annual Conference, because they are limited by the boundaries of their jurisdiction.

John F. Goucher: I understand the statement made by Bish-

op Cooke possibly arises under a misapprehension of the significance of the action proposed. I may be mistaken (maybe I am more likely to be than he is), but if I understand the proposition, it is simply a recognition of missionary episcopacy as we have it in the Methodist Episcopal Church, eliminating the offensive term "missionary." I think, therefore, there is benefit in attempting something that has worked reasonably well and eliminating the most objectionable features of the thing, and, therefore, I approve it heartily.

David G. Downey: I desire to get straight in my thinking. Do I understand that the present plan contemplates the following types of bishops: (1) bishops elected by the Regional Conferences; (2) bishops elected by the Central Conferences; (3) bishops elected by the General Conference for Central Conferences of less than 150,000 members?

Edgar Blake: May I say that the report of the committee does not touch the matter at all as to the election of bishops? You have already provided that a Central Conference having 150,000 or more shall elect the bishops allotted to it by the General Conference. You have already provided that the General Conference shall elect bishops for those Central Conferences who do not elect their own. You have already provided that the Regional Conferences shall elect bishops for their Regional Jurisdictions, subject, as all are, to confirmation by the General Conference.

David G. Downey: Then I am correct that there are those three types of bishops?

Edgar Blake: No, sir; but you are correct in this, that provision has been made for the election of bishops by three different jurisdictions, but not representing three different types of bishops.

David G. Downey: That may be a distinction without a difference.

Edgar Blake: I think not.

David G. Downey: The Central Conference elects a number of bishops allotted to it subject to confirmation by the General Conference and they are somewhat limited; that is one type. The Regional Conference elects its bishops subject to confirmation by the General Conference, and they are largely without restrictions: that is another type. The General Conference itself, without any nominations and without any restrictions, elects certain bishops who are to preside for the Central Conferences that have less than 150,000. Am I correct?

Edgar Blake: You are correct as to the body which elects.

Rolla V. Watt: I want to ask whether there is any requirement that the bishop elected by the General Conference for a

Central Conference shall be chosen from the Central Conference?

Edgar Blake: No, sir.

Rolla V. Watt: They may be chosen from anywhere?

Edgar Blake: Yes, sir.

John M. Moore: I do not find any place where it says the bishops for Central Conferences having less than 150,000 members shall be elected by the General Conference.

Edgar Blake: Under Section 5, "Powers of the General Conference," it is provided for. The questions raised hardly have to do with the matter under consideration. I move the adoption.

The motion was seconded.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): May I speak from the chair without the formality of calling somebody to it, not so much to make an argument as to call attention to my views? Of course, we have a right to any form of government we determine to adopt in the Church, but unless I have misread civics you put men who are to perform certain functions on different bases as to the electorates, and that is not only dangerous, but it tends to confusion. The English government had the largest difficulty growing out of that fact, and possibly but for its failure in that regard there would not have been any American Revolution. Now, is it the mind of the Joint Commission that the constitution of the Church provide that the bishops having the smallest temporary jurisdiction—that is, within a sphere which has less than 150,000 members—should, in the estimate of the Church, have the largest and best election, the only bishops elected by the General Conference? I think we need to consider that. There will be a difference made in the Church among the bishops as determined by the vote that elected them. We have found it impossible in either of our Churches to prevent some distinctions even between the bishops elected on different ballots, and we have even come to the point in our Churches where if two men are elected on the same ballot, that man is senior whose name begins with the earlier letter of the alphabet; and while there is no provision in either branch of Methodism as to any function to be performed by a courtesy among the bishops themselves, we happen to know, all of us, that there is quite a difference between a senior bishop of the Church and his colleague. Hence, without going into this matter fully which has been sprung on us in the last day of the meeting, I call attention to some of the possibilities in the amendment before us.

Rolla V. Watt: I see those possibilities, but I cannot see any way out. The fact is, I would be very averse to allowing a Central Conference with less than 150,000 to elect its own bishops. They must have bishops, but it can only be for the General

Conference to elect them. When you have them elected for the Central Conference, I cannot see why they ought not to be confined to that Conference just as well as the bishops elected by the Central Conference. It seems to me if you are elected by the General Conference as a general superintendent or bishop for a Central Conference, your operations should be limited just as closely as those bishops elected by that Central Conference.

Edgar Blake: I do not quite see the force of the objections either by the Chairman or by Dr. Watt.

Rolla V. Watt: I can only thank you for the title.

Edgar Blake: I could give you more. As a matter of fact, in the Methodist Episcopal Church we do not take very seriously the distinctions which the bishops create among themselves, but which the Church does not recognize.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The bishops do not create them. It was the voice of the Church that put them on the bishops.

Edgar Blake: Speaking for my own denomination, we do not recognize the distinctions of seniority. As a matter of fact, there are many of us who feel that is a thing that ought to be gotten rid of as quickly as possible in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and that the designation of a man who chances to be elected first as "senior bishop," regardless of his fitness for that position, is a thing which ought not to continue.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): If my memory serves me, and it generally does, Asbury makes the statement that in 1808 McKendree was elected assistant bishop.

Bishop Mouzon: He made a mistake on that.

John M. Moore: I rise to suggest that really the criticism offered by Bishop Denny and Mr. Watt does not hold as regards this one section. I think they do hold as regards that which will be discussed when we come to the "Powers of the General Conference," Subsection 5, so I think we might pass this and when we come to Subsection 5 we might discuss it.

Edgar Blake: We are devoting a whole lot of time upon a matter upon which there seems to be unanimous agreement.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The motion is that in the printed report of the Committee of Conference, second page, under "Powers," Section 3, you add at the close of Section 3 the following words: "The privileges, powers, and duties of a bishop elected by a Central Conference shall be limited to that jurisdiction."

Frank M. Thomas: You do not state accurately the title to the paper.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I took it from his own paper.

Edgar Blake: It is to be added to the first paragraph of Section 4 of Article VII.

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

Edgar Blake: Now, turn to Subsection 5, Section 2 of Article VIII., "Powers of the General Conference."

Bishop Leete: I move that the following words be added to Subsection 5 of Section 2 of Article VIII.: "Except as herein otherwise provided."

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That is to be added to the report of the Committee on Other Conferences, under "Powers," Subsection 5, at the close of the sentence add the words "except as herein otherwise provided."

The amendment being seconded and a vote being taken, it was carried.

Edgar Blake: Now, I move that the words "or to a Central Conference Jurisdiction to which he was elected" be inserted in the eighth line of Subsection 7 after the word "elected."

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

Bishop Cooke: I would like for it to be definite here. (Reading): "Any bishop may be assigned by the general superintendents." Will you define those general superintendents? Who are they and where do they belong, to what jurisdiction do they belong?

David G. Downey: Wait for the Judicial Council; they will define that.

Bishop Cooke: I am voting on this language here, and I want it defined here.

Edgar Blake: A general superintendent is one elected by a Regional Conference or elected by a General Conference who is subject to residential assignment to any jurisdiction under certain limitations or subject to presidential assignment to any Annual Conference under certain limitations.

Bishop Cooke: To any Annual Conference throughout the whole Church?

Edgar Blake: Yes. Now, I move that in Section 7, first line, top of page 6, the words "Regional Conference" be stricken out and the word "Jurisdiction" inserted.

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

Edgar Blake: Now, I move that the following words be inserted at the close of that paragraph: "But the consent of the General Conference delegation shall not be necessary to assign or transfer a bishop to or from a Central Conference Jurisdiction." I move the adoption of that amendment.

The motion was seconded.

Rolla V. Watt: Is not that the point where I raised the ques-

tion as to whether you may transfer a bishop elected for a Central Conference to any place in the Church you please?

Edgar Blake: The General Conference. The reason for that is this, that there is a feeling in the mind of many—for instance, about Eastern Asia—that the Church ought to select its strongest men for episcopal assignment to that jurisdiction. Indeed, with few exceptions, in our own Church that is what we have done. We have assigned Bishop Bashford, Bishop Lewis, and Bishop Welch to that jurisdiction. If we need to assign those men to another jurisdiction, this provides that it can be done without the consent of those Central Conference delegations.

A vote being taken, the amendment was agreed to.

Bishop Leete: This does not seem to be a very large matter, but I think there is an element of great fairness in it. It is the one to which I referred the other day with reference to presidential supervision. I have a feeling that while we may be wisely doing away with general superintendencies—for, as a matter of fact, we are practically doing it, although we retain the term in some form and the shadow for a while—we should not nail things down so tight that there cannot be any interchange between the regions. I do not speak of the General Conference. I think we who preside from day to day need to be occasionally in other parts of the Church than the one with which we are affiliated. I think it narrows a man as a president to be consigned to a little piece of ground or to some little static position. I think it narrows the region to have only one incumbent, and never to have any outside voice or presence in the presentation of truth. I think there is a tremendous educational function both ways, a broadening of our episcopal leaders and of the areas themselves which comes from an interchange of presidencies. I think the matter ought to be guarded very carefully. I think there should not be constant interference, and I believe in holding fast to everything local in the way of legislation and management. But I feel that is sufficiently protected by the fact that we have the resident bishops, and the Regional Conference can take care of all legislative matters. We have guarded that, but we have not sufficiently provided for an interchange of presidency. You have also provided for what may be possibly an unpleasant thing. Suppose a man is assigned to go and preside in a Conference in another region, and suppose for some reason the bishops in that region do not want that man to come in and suppose those bishops refuse to concur in his appointment. That becomes a scandal in the Church. That is a thing to be avoided; therefore I have a couple of alternative amendments. I would like the first of them, if the members would agree to it; but if they will not, I would like the second. I think

we all see the point. It does seem to me that is a matter here that is vital to our connectionalism. We do want connectionalism in some form. We do not want to be a lot of little segregated bodies with insular ideas. Therefore, I think this matter is germane to what is under consideration and well worthy of being considered. My suggestion is, in place of the words we have here now, to make it read as follows:

Any bishop may be assigned by the general superintendents to any Annual Conference for presidential supervision, provided that in a majority of instances the presiding bishop in each Conference shall be one of the resident bishops of the region in which he presides.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Where does that come in?

Bishop Leete: In Section 7, the fourth line from the bottom, it reads now: "But any bishop may be assigned by the general superintendents to any Annual Conference for presidential supervision if a majority of the resident bishops in the jurisdiction to which he is assigned shall concur in said assignment." In place of that I suggest to make it read:

Any bishop may be assigned by the general superintendents to any Annual Conference for presidential supervision, provided that in a majority of instances the presiding bishop in each Conference shall be one of the resident bishops of the region in which he presides.

David G. Downey: What do you mean by "a majority"?

Bishop Leete: The effect of that would be that three times out of four it would be a resident, and it is not revolutionary to provide that once out of four he shall be from some other region.

Bishop McDowell: One time out of four times they may be assigned without the consent of the resident bishops?

Bishop Leete: Now, I will read the other alternative suggestion, though I do not like it. But I like it better than what we have here. What we have here is as I have said: "But any bishop may be assigned by the general superintendents to any Annual Conference for presidential supervision if a majority of the resident bishops of the jurisdiction to which he is assigned shall concur in said assignment." I want instead of that to have it read: "But any bishop may be assigned by the general superintendents to any Annual Conference for presidential supervision unless a majority of the resident bishops of the jurisdiction to which he is assigned refuse to concur in said assignment." You see the difference. In one case they have to come together and concur, and in the other case they have to come together and nonconcur. I do not like this last proposition as well as my first. I think the first is better, but I prefer this second to what it now is. What I propose is not only just, but a refusal to grant it would indicate a lack of confidence in our

general superintendents, a lack of confidence in ourselves, and a lack of confidence in the substance of conectionalism.

E. B. Chappell: I may be mixed in my mathematics, but I cannot work out that one in four.

Bishop Leete: The way I have it is "a majority of instances." I am willing for it to be three out of four or three out of five, but I want a change once in a while.

A. J. Lamar: I rise to a point of order.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Dr. Lamar will please state his point of order.

A. J. Lamar: Are we operating under the five-minute rule?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Yes.

A. J. Lamar: Is it being enforced?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Yes, within the recognized—

Bishop Leete: If Dr. Lamar refers to me, I have not been up five minutes, and I am making a motion and not a speech.

A. J. Lamar: I was not personal. I am willing to give all the time necessary, but if we are under the five-minute rule, it should be enforced.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): It is being enforced.

C. M. Bishop: Is there wisdom in having that first amendment suggested by Bishop Leete? He is providing that in a majority of instances the bishops in a certain jurisdiction shall preside for that, or shall we not leave it as it is with some slight modification, so that unless there is objection in the jurisdiction the general superintendents may send some bishop resident in another jurisdiction at almost any time?

Bishop Cooke: That would be all right.

C. M. Bishop: Yes, so I fear Bishop Leete's first amendment would tend toward the creation of diocesan conceptions rather than the one upon which we are now engaged.

Rolla V Watt: I cannot quite believe that we are unwilling to trust our Board of Bishops, or whatever you decide to call them, to make the assignments for presidential purposes. I cannot imagine that that condition is going to arise, and I want to offer as a substitute for what is before us that we strike out the words "unless a majority of the resident bishops of the jurisdiction to which he is assigned shall concur in said assignment." That would leave it in the hands of the Board of Bishops.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I am a little at a loss as to the exact parliamentary status of things—

Bishop Leete: I am perfectly willing to accept Brother Watt's suggestion; and if we cannot get that I am willing to accept Brother Bishop's, and for the purpose of getting the thing be-

fore us properly, I will withdraw the whole of mine and let Brother Watt's be offered.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That is to strike out certain words in the provision now before us?

Rolla V. Watt: Yes.

John F. Goucher: Where are they located?

Rolla V. Watt: They are in the third to the last line. I move to strike out the words "if a majority of the resident bishops of the jurisdiction to which he is assigned shall concur in said assignment." Those are the words that I move to strike out.

Edgar Blake: I do not know whether this point of order is well taken or not, but it is worth considering. The matter before us is the status of the bishops elected by or for the Central Conferences. That was the matter that was referred to the Committee of Conference, and that is the only matter on which we have reported.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The point is not well taken for the reason that we are amending Subsection 7, and hence have the subsection under consideration, and it is within the province of the Joint Commission to do anything it may please to do with that subsection.

Bishop McDowell: I think that decision is more or less correct.

Edgar Blake: I agree with that.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): For the emphatic support that Bishop McDowell gives me, I am grateful.

Bishop McDowell: But I think we have gradually got pretty far afield from the real subject that we wanted to be considering this morning. Now, if a motion is necessary to bring us back to that, I will make the motion that we continue to work directly upon the report of the Committee of Conference before this subject is finally disposed of, it only having been tentatively passed in the other place, and these amendments and discussions can come in.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): A motion to postpone the consideration of any amendment is in order.

Edgar Blake: I second that motion.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I did not make any motion. The Chair is not judge, jury, prosecutor, and witness.

Bishop McDowell: With this hypnotic assistance of the Chair, I will make that motion.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Abram W. Harris: I want to inquire why, when you are presiding in your own proper capacity, you may not make a motion in one of your other capacities?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): A sort of water-tight compartment.

George Warren Brown: Has the committee completed its report?

Edgar Blake: The committee has completed its report.

George Warren Brown: The committee has reported that it has failed to come to an agreement on three points. I wish to make a motion that relates to those three points, and after reading the motion I would like to speak on the motion within my allotted time. This motion will be called Motion A and Motion B:

A. If Article VIII. is made to read "may" in place of "shall," in that case each Central Jurisdiction shall have representation in the General Conference by five ministerial and five lay delegates, and such delegates shall have the right to speak in the General Conference and in its Standing Committees on all matters that relate to and affect the interests of the jurisdictions which they represent, but said representation shall not have the right to vote; or,

B. If Article VIII. is made to read "shall," in that case each Central Jurisdiction shall have representation in the General Conference by the ratio of representation based on eight delegates for a membership of 100,000 or less and one ministerial and one lay representative thereafter for every additional 100,000 members or fractional two-thirds thereof, and such delegates shall have the right to speak and vote in the General Conference and in its Standing Committees on all matters that relate to and affect the interest of the jurisdictions which they represent.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Is the motion seconded?

It was seconded by several.

George Warren Brown: I have said before this body that I should be ashamed to go home and leave unturned any stone possible to effect this unification plan, to put up some consistent and fair plan which we have a reasonable hope that our two General Conferences will approve, and I am presenting here a compromise. What does it mean to change the word "shall," as we now have it in the report of the Committee of Eight, to "may"? It means that if we put "may" in the other two contentions are allowed to stand as they are, which deprives the representation of the Central Jurisdictions from voting in the General Conference in any manner. It makes it possible for us to have victory out of our labors here instead of defeat. It makes possible success instead of failure if we can agree upon this term rather than the more harsh word. Now, if it is not possible for us to get together and agree upon Motion A of this resolution, which carries the word "may," then it does provide that we can agree upon Motion B, which leaves in the word "shall." If we do that, what does that mean? It means that we adopt the plan of proportionate representation which would give

a maximum at the present time of twelve delegates of the colored membership of the Methodist Episcopal Church with the addition of two members from each 100,000 after 300,000, which now would be the maximum. It provides for the same situation or basis of representation for each of the other Central Jurisdictions, and I want to say right here, brethren, that we are prone to think only of the Colored Central Jurisdictions in all our discussions here. I submit that we must relate ourselves to the other four jurisdictions, Eastern Asia, Southern Asia, Europe, and Latin America, and if we can do this we certainly must appreciate the importance of our now making a report that we can agree upon to make possible unification at a time—as it was said yesterday—when we are at the crest. So may we not get together on one of these alternate plans? If the word “shall” remains, the only thing we ask for in this motion is that the Central Jurisdiction’s representation in the General Conference shall have the right to vote on those things which relate to its jurisdiction.

Charles M. Stuart: I would like to present at this time, if it is in order, a motion with regard to the method of procedure in this whole matter:

A Central Conference may be advanced to the status of a Jurisdictional General Conference under the following provisions:

1. A Central Conference may at any time apply to the General Conference for permission to organize itself into a Jurisdictional General Conference, and upon receiving a majority vote of two-thirds of the General Conference in favor of the application shall be organized; or,

2. When any Central Conference has 600,000 members in full connection, the General Conference, through a Standing Committee on Jurisdictional Organization, composed of an equal number of representatives from the several Regional Conferences, together with — representatives from the Central Conference under consideration, shall consider and report upon the qualifications of said Central Conference for advancement to the status of a Jurisdictional General Conference. A favorable vote of three-fourths of said standing committee shall, without further action, advance said Central Conference to the status of a Jurisdictional General Conference.

J. R. Pepper: Would that first point mean any size, without reference to membership?

Bishop McDowell: Yes, if the General Conference grants it.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Now, the status is that Brother Brown moves an amendment and Dr. Stuart moves a substitute for the amendment.

George Warren Brown: Is that a substitute?

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That is the only way in which it can come in.

George Warren Brown: You make a substitute motion, but you are not taking care of the basis of representation in the Gen-

eral Conference of the Central Jurisdiction which my motion relates to. That ought to be done.

Charles M. Stuart: What I am after here is to get the distinction between "may" and "shall."

John R. Pepper: Would it not be better where you say "three-fourths of said Standing Committee and without further consideration" to have it read "with the concurrence of the General Conference"?

Charles M. Stuart: I was talking with Dr. Lamar about shifting the initiative of the Central Conference to the General Conference, and he said that owing to the composition of the General Conference the vote of the North would be three to two against the South, and that, therefore, the case would be prejudiced. I can see that for practical purposes this might be a very serious thing for the Church, South, to carry through in their General and Annual Conferences. The plan proposed makes provision for a standing committee which shall be made up half from the North and half from the South, with a limited representation from the Central Conference under consideration. It will not be referred back to the General Conference because, if it were, the same conditions would obtain to which Dr. Lamar justly takes exception. By the arrangement proposed the determination would lie in a body composed equally from the North and the South.

W N Ainsworth: Plus.

Charles M. Stuart: Plus the Central Conference representatives under consideration.

A. F. Watkins: May I ask a question?

Charles M. Stuart: Certainly.

A. F. Watkins: Do I understand that that committee which is to pass on the application is composed of an equal representation from the Central Conference—

Charles M. Stuart: No, it is to be composed of equal numbers—I will read it, "an equal number of representatives from the several Regional Conferences."

A. F. Watkins: I thought you said Central.

Charles M. Stuart: No, the several Regional Conferences.

A. F. Watkins: Then what? I thought the equal number was to be equal to that blank number.

Charles M. Stuart: No, together with a number yet to be determined.

A. F. Watkins: Representing the Conference making the application?

Charles M. Stuart: Yes. I cannot tell you how disappointed I was when it was reported that there was likely to be no chance of agreement on this particular issue. To me this Com-

mission is really the Church on trial. If we go out from here making confession that this body of intelligent representatives of the two great forward-looking denominations of this country cannot settle a matter of this kind, we may be able, as Bishop Mouzon says, to explain to the Methodists of America, but it will be an explanation that will not explain. We shall be hopelessly discredited by the thoughtful and devout people of the American nation. In the universal and earnest discussion of democracy the whole nation is looking for us to furnish some solution of this aspect of the question. We have absolutely no answer except personal prejudice. We hear a great deal about race consciousness. I think that is a misnomer. The judgment of the world on this particular issue will be made up, not by race consciousness at all, but by the rising tide of Christian consciousness, and that judgment will be all against us. If we were like the councils of old seeking to determine a purely academic question, that would be one thing and an inconsiderable thing. But this is a matter affecting men and women. Not only that, it is a matter touching American men and women, American citizens. Brethren, we cannot afford to go out and say to the world that we cannot get together on a matter of that kind. I offer this resolution now as a forlorn hope that something will come out of it that will enable us to go out with a report upon which we can agree. We do not expect a full report, but we want a working report. I would deprecate sending out two reports. The moment we send a divided report we put the discussion into the General Conference where temper is easily and surely generated. I hope that we can arrive at something that will bring the Churches together at once.

George Warren Brown: Brother Stuart's motion is to take the place of my motion, therefore I would like the pleasure of seconding it.

Frank M. Thomas: Do you withdraw yours?

George Warren Brown: For the present.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): The original motion is withdrawn, and the only motion before us is that of Dr. Stuart's.

A. J. Lamar: We might as well face this question before us squarely and understand distinctly what is involved. Underneath all of your verbiage and all your different methods of expression there remains this difference in the two views, the difference between "may" and "must," for "shall" there has the force of "must." You may say this is simply a very light question of a word. I believe it was Mirabeau in the general assembly of France who said that words are things; and Carlyle, commenting on it, said that there are things and tremendous things in the mouth of a certain Mirabeau. Here we are. There

is a principle involved, "may" or "must." "Must" looks to definite cessation of the existence of the negro in the reorganized Church as a Central Conference, a termination of that relation at a definite period, while "may" leaves the whole question open. He may or he may not terminate the one relation and begin the other relation at a definite time. There is the difference. Now, I want unification; but I must say that just as long as you brethren stand upon the principle which is contained in both motions that were before us I, for one, must stand unalterably on the report of the Committee of Eight. I agreed with misgiving because I did not believe it was for the best of the negro or the white man or best for the reorganized Church—I agreed with that statement which was the statement of Judge Henry Wade Rogers, and there I must stand. I cannot move from that platform. If you brethren cannot move from it, then it seems to me there is nothing left for us to do but to report to our General Conferences that we have agreed on this or that and the other thing, but that on this question of the status of the negro in the reorganized Church your Commission was unable to agree.

Rolla V. Watt: I am glad that Dr. Lamar has made that very positive statement in his views, because they coincide exactly with mine. My feeling has been from the first that under no circumstances, even if I stood alone, would I be a party to depriving any section of our membership of what I regarded as substantially their rights, nor would I. I have felt all the while that if this report could be modified to the point that these Central Conferences could choose whether or not they should go out, then they would need have no representation in the General Conference, it would be their own choice; but if they were forced to go into this new relation they must have actual representation in the General Conference. Either one suits me. But to say when they get to 600,000 that they must relinquish their rights to the General Conference and go into a new relation is something that I never can and never will vote for. So I think we are heading up pretty close to the place where we must make separate reports. I believe we should have union, but I believe on just grounds. You believe the same thing, but we regard the just grounds from different points of view.

Bishop Hamilton: I think, now, sir, I hold a very different view from either of these two Commissions. I honor openly and sincerely my brother who holds an opposite view which is stated so clearly and concisely. I believe we have come to a fundamental difference that exists between the two sections of the country as well as the two sections of the Church, and I do not believe it is competent for us in this Joint Commission to settle this matter until the country has settled it or until the en-

tire constituency of both Churches has expressed its judgment. I stated to the brethren of our Commission the other night that I could not vote for either "shall" or "may," and this is the reason why I rose to say here, that I must decline to vote either way because I could not choose between what to my mind are two evils. And I might as well say, while I am on the floor, that I have been opposed to this whole question of breaking up our episcopacy into practical diocesan districts or regions. But all that is occasioned by the fundamental differences. Why am I opposed to both? For these reasons (and let me start first with the fact that you hold a very different relation to this matter from what our Church does): If our colored membership were in precisely the same relation to us as the C. M. E. is to yours, we could start upon common grounds; but advantage is taken of us in asking us to dispose of a certain membership already within our Church, and within our Church upon this fundamental difference of view as to their color. Now I cannot favor "shall" or "may" for this reason: I do not believe it is a matter of Christian courtesy—merely good manners. I don't believe it is a matter consistent with Christian fellowship for us, having the majority, even to suggest to any minority part of our membership the question of going out either by "shall" or "may." It ought to originate with them. No, it ought not to originate anywhere. I think the colored members hold precisely the same relation to us that 350,000 of our members who are women hold, or that 350,000 of our members who are white and live along the borderland. There should not be two kinds of members, basing the difference of the two kinds upon either the political or racial views of the two sections of the country and the two sections of the Church. It seems the honorable way, without all this diversion and these excursions by wandering in the wilderness of compromises, would be for us to go where the ultimate authorities exist for the settlement of the matter. I believe Dr. Lamar has put the matter succinctly in stating the way that it must go—namely, to the General Conferences.

Bishop Leete: I think perhaps we are in danger here of rather too generally classifying the people of this country. The truth of it is, there is nothing absolutely sectional about this matter that is now before us. There are lines of stratification running through all parts of the United States upon every problem relating to races which are not to be placed on any boundary that can be assigned between what we call sections of America. Now, the intimation has been made to me, and I believe there is truth in it, that it is thoroughly possible that one General Conference or the other General Conference might be more liberal on a given point than either of the Commissions rep-

resented here may find itself able to be upon any particular point. In other words, I think it is a very grave mistake for us to conclude that all wisdom is summed up in a body of twenty-five men on the other side, although I do not think we are as far apart as some of them think we are. But we are here representing certain constituencies. We are not here as individuals, but with restrictions upon us, not simply in the matter of our appointment, but of certain limitations from the people whom we love and whose interest we should serve. Brothers, we could make no greater blunder, we could do no more calamitous thing for the kingdom of God than to commit any part of our membership willy-nilly to the *summum bonum* of our present wisdom. And I think in my heart that we could make no greater blunder at this moment than to send to either Conference a conclusion so complete as to subject us to the charge that we had gotten together and had surrendered our convictions not simply, but the convictions of the people we represent, and that everything was done and fixed up so that there was no room for further negotiation. I am perfectly satisfied that at this stage we could not do anything worse for our people than to bring out something that seems to be so complete as to act as an embarrassment to further negotiations. What do I mean by that? Let me be perfectly sincere. I mean we should get together on everything possible, or we ought to make every reasonable concession to get together on anything that we can get together on—

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): I am sorry to call attention to the fact that the time limit has expired.

Bishop Leete: I will finish in a sentence. But, if there is some residual clause that we cannot agree upon, we should frankly say so, and with all kindness and good will let our people straighten us out.

Charles A. Pollock: A question of order.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): State it.

Charles A. Pollock: If I remember correctly, some one made a motion yesterday that we vote upon this question at 10:30.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): That motion was made, but it was not carried.

Bishop Cranston: It does not appear to me to be a light matter that we should consider the possibility of adjourning without having reached an agreement in the completion of some plan which shall be submitted to the judgment of our General Conferences. We may in our zeal for the interest of our Churches or the consistency of their historic attitude toward one question forget the fundamental conception of the Church of Jesus Christ. I insist upon it that in discussing the status of

the negro in the Church we are not discussing a question that is fundamental in any doctrine of salvation through Jesus Christ. I insist that we are placing our ideas of what is good ecclesiastical structural work about the divine element in the teachings of Christianity as a scheme of salvation; and I cannot consent that this record shall be closed without uttering one more protest against the subordination of the spiritual ideal to the conventional, or to the consistency of either of our Churches with its past record. The status of the negro in our ecclesiastical structure is an incidental question. Incidental to what? Incidental to the far larger matter of our common obligation for his moral and religious uplift—that concerns the entire race in our country—the status of a few as it shall affect the religious life of the mass of negroes. Relatively, the status of the negro in our Church will be of little moment. We can fix his status more safely and effectively if we seek before God to comprehend the magnitude of our opportunity to do him good. His first lessons in politics were corrupting and degrading, and it is no great wonder that his conceptions of humanity rights revolve about a ballot box or in the Church around the bishopric. He learned that from white men. In the beginning of his free career his poverty made him a dependent. For all his educational opportunities he was dependent. For his employment and livelihood he was dependent; and for both education and a living he is still in a state of dependency as a mass. God has given him friends and helpers, but as for the race at large, his status is that of immaturity, morally, intellectually, and politically. To call him to duties beyond his preparation would only add ridicule to his deprivations and to his wrongs, for he has been wronged and is being wronged all the while. But the negro race is developing. Negroes of the first generation out of slavery have made remarkably great strides in art, letters, and the professions as well as in the trades and farming industries. The possibilities of the race are shown to be full of promise and worthy of much more rapid development. If the Church does not care for these American negroes, morally and religiously, nobody will care for them, and their growth will be perilous to themselves and to society. They will be led and exploited by dangerous men and more dangerous isms. But the Church must find the middle course. The negro must be left to venture and succeed for himself. He must have independence and self-reliance in his undertakings. Too much materialism—too much Church materialism—will keep him weak and defenseless. A man of any race is stronger for sympathy, but he is weaker for persistent coddling. More education, more evangelism, but more self-direction will be far better just now than the stimulation of

unrealized ambitions and the encouragement of the natural human passion for superficial distinctions and barren recognitions.

David G. Downey: With everything that has been said here this morning about the wisdom and almost the necessity of getting some sort of an agreement if we are not to be discredited, I am in hearty accord. I confess to a feeling of great discouragement this morning, although I am not without hope that some ray of light may come. It is sometimes darkest just before the dawn.

C. M. Bishop: It is about time for the dawn then.

David G. Downey: I am thankful that Bishop Mouzon in his admirable paper and also Dr. Lamar have put before us the difference so plainly that we can all understand it. In that paper of Bishop Mouzon's he called attention to some things that had been granted by the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and particularized the granting of representation in the General Conference to the Central Conferences. The difficulty with some of the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church is that they feel what has been granted by way of representation to the Central Conferences in the General Conference is taken away by the provision of Article VIII. That provision distinctly declares that at a specified time those representatives must go out, and go out without any word of their own. And I think I do not misunderstand Dr. Lamar when I say that he accepts the report of the Committee of Eight because it looks forward to a specified time at which there shall be no negro members in the General Conference. Is that correct?

A. J. Lamar: That is right.

David G. Downey: That is not only true, but it also looks forward to the time when there shall be no representatives of any of the Central Conferences in the General Conference, and the objection that some of us have to the report of the Committee of Eight is that it does just that thing. It closes the door at a specified time to representatives of any Central Conference in the General Conference. It gives no chance for the developing thought of the Church. It gives no opportunity for the play of the Holy Spirit, but says in effect that we have wisdom for all time, and it is because of that that some of us in our hearts cannot accept the report of the Committee of Eight as it stands. If the report of the Committee of Eight could be so modified as to give opportunity for the growth of Christian consciousness, for the modifying of ideals in the progress of ten or fifteen or twenty-five years, for the play of the Spirit of God upon the minds and hearts of the united Church—if only some such opportunity as that might be given to us, I think we could come

to an agreement; but the report of the Committee of Eight does, as it seems to us, close the door, and that too without any opportunity for those against whom the door is closed to have a word to say about it.

Bishop McDowell: I am sincerely desirous of saying, if I can, another word that may help toward what we all desire. In order that I may not be moved to say what I ought not to say, let me begin with this statement: Let us assume that everyone of us is equally moved by the spiritual motives of this great thing. The statement just made by my dear friend and senior colleague, which calls upon us to consider this question from the highest level, has my full and hearty approval. Certain sentences in his address would easily allow the inference that possibly in his mind some of us are laying stress upon what is incidental and technical rather than what is spiritual and supreme. I will not allow myself for one minute even to be provoked into a reply to that sentence or its implications. I cannot pray as I have prayed this day without sincerely desiring to speak in the spirit in which we have all prayed. And, therefore, I only say that I hope no sentence of my own here or hereafter will be subject to any interpretation that puts any one's attitude upon any except a common level of devotion to the principles of the Lord Jesus Christ. Now, I wonder if you will let me go ahead in my slow way awhile and extend my time if need be? This matter that is before us is not simply the negro matter. It is the Latin American matter, the Asiatic matter, the European matter. I want to lay out a plan not quite in the form of a motion or to make it a substitute for all that is before us, but for your consideration. We had yesterday and again this morning three particular items under consideration: (1) The representation of the Central Conferences in the General Conference; (2) the erection of Central Conferences into Jurisdictional General Conferences; (3) the representation of the Jurisdictional General Conferences in the General Conference, and their rights. In Dr. Wallace's amendment yesterday a more generous recognition was accorded to the Latin American, European, and Asiatic Central Conferences, slightly at the expense of the Central Conference for Colored People. Maybe that is a good name. I would be glad to have these principles and plans adopted: (1) That Dr. Wallace's amendment should be adopted which would start the Central Conferences other than the Central Conference for the Colored People upon a larger numerical representation than would be accorded them under Mr. Watt's amendment. I would then be glad to have that representation to those Central Conferences increased in accordance with Dr. Wallace's proposition up to the time when these Central Conferences have

500,000 members or 600,000 members and at that time allow those Central Conferences by formal vote of the Annual Conferences composing them to elect whether they would continue as Central Conferences without any further increase in their representation in the General Conference or become Jurisdictional General Conferences with a decrease in their representation to ten delegates in the General Conference with power to speak and vote, and with the further provision that the General Conference should have ten delegates if it chooses in each Jurisdictional General Conference with power to speak and vote. That makes a barrier against an impossible number, as we think of it, of delegates in the General Conference from one of the Central Conferences. That makes it impossible for our Church in Southern Asia when it shall attain, as, please God, it would if we had the men and money, to a million or two or three million members, to send hundreds of delegates to the General Conference. They are allowed to send a limited number, but it puts a barrier against increasing that number beyond a certain figure. It also puts a barrier against the destruction of the representation that is real and genuine. I think that representation ought to be real and genuine for two reasons: First, referring to the analogy of Territory and States, there is a very great difference between a Territory that is asking for statehood and a State that is asked to become a territory. Our members—I do not mean the Methodist Episcopal Church members alone—but our members in Latin America, Asia, and Europe are in the position of a State, and it is a pretty serious thing that we are proposing to reduce their representation as we are proposing to do it numerically, for we are asking them to accept a tremendous reduction, and we shall come straight up against the enormous pressure of the whole foreign missionary sentiment when we even propose this thing. For other reasons it is important that the delegations should be real delegations and the membership a real membership. For a man who speaks is of vastly more consequence in the body in which he speaks when he has also a right to vote. But, Mr. President and dear brethren, there is a feature about which no word has been said: We are concerned about the Church of God in the whole world. No one can be familiar with the history of India without knowing that Hinduism has a vast capacity for extinguishing other religions by absorbing them. Do not set that Indian Church off in such fashion that that Hinduizing tendency can finally extinguish it. Put, therefore, into the India Jurisdictional General Conference perpetually ten men from the Church at home who may be able to save it from the Hinduizing tendency. Do the same elsewhere to save us in Latin America from what is certain to come in this world, from the

Romanizing tendency. Do not doubt at all that if Latin America is set up into a Jurisdictional General Conference and the bonds between the Church at home and the Church there are lessened and weakened, virtually cut—do not for one moment overlook the fact that there will be just as surely as anything a Romanizing movement which our friends the Roman Catholic Church are perfectly competent to start and manipulate and conduct. Now, I have held out this matter in the hope that possibly it might suggest itself as helping toward this solution that we covet. It may be that it is impossible for you to accept it. It may be impossible for us to accept less, but for the sake of Jesus Christ and his Church, whom and which we love, maybe this is what we ought to accept. It would prevent the presence of an abnormal representation from the Central Conferences. Under Dr. Wallace's amendment there would never be above eighteen persons from any Central Conference. If they elected to go into a Jurisdictional General Conference with increased powers, their representation would drop from eighteen to ten. It is quite as important, in my judgment, that we should be represented in their Jurisdictional General Conference actually as that they should be represented in ours. I would look forward to the day when the negro shall be organized into a separate and independent Church virtually the same as we look forward to the time when the Chinese or the Europeans or the Latin Americans shall be organized into a separate Church. All must be treated alike. I will go back to what I said the other day and repeat that not for one minute should we make any careful tabulation of what we have given up or what you have given up, or what we have surrendered or what you have surrendered. Let us not see how the book stands at that point, but let us see how far we can go together, and together with Him and together with all the faces and all the nations. You will pardon me for speaking at such length again. Maybe what I have said is of no value, but I must omit nothing that I can say or do in accordance with my responsibility to my Church and to Jesus Christ, and you should omit nothing in accordance with what you can offer or in accordance with your responsibility to the Church and Jesus Christ toward the solution of this question. I do not want a Church that is sectionalized. I do not want a Church that is racialized. I do not want a Church that is nationalized. I want one Church of Jesus Christ the world around, and it seems to me—it may not seem so to you at all—but it seems to me that this will secure all that is vital anywhere without injury to any section or portion or sentiment in either Church.

Bishop Cranston: I rise to a question of personal privilege.

I think I have been misunderstood by Bishop McDowell. In challenging the plane upon which the discussion was being conducted I did not intend in any sense a reflection upon the spiritual integrity of any man participating in it. What I meant and what I have thought for some years is that the ecclesiastical should be subordinated to the spiritual in the Church of Christ. I look upon the ecclesiastical machinery of the Church as simply a sort of structural necessity for the creation and application of the strength there is in organization; and it does seem to me that the discussions are proceeding with an undue emphasis upon the ecclesiastical and to the practical subordination of the spiritual; but I would take my place at the feet of Bishop McDowell or other men here when it comes to the measurement of my life by spiritual truth. God forbid that I should be of those who can see only the good that is in themselves. There is so much in most of you that is to me, as I measure myself, superior to what I have attained, that I am almost overwhelmed by the comparison. No, Bishop McDowell, I want every man to stand for his convictions; and as I interpret the value and power of the spiritual in the individual life they are manifested in the utterances I have just heard from my brother which I attribute to the development of the Christ ideals of his own soul.

Bishop McDowell: A question of personal privilege.

The Chairman (Bishop Denny): Proceed.

Bishop McDowell: I accept Bishop Cranston's statement fully. I only felt and I now feel that his first words might easily lead to the inference I put upon them, not because that he at all intended that they should lead to that inference. But I also desire to make it perfectly clear for myself that in the discussion of these matters that may seem to be matters of ecclesiastical interest, no man of us is subordinating the thing that is spiritual and supreme to the thing that is unspiritual or ethical or simply ecclesiastical.

John M. Moore: Under our order we are to adjourn this evening at six o'clock. We have before us the report of the Committee of Eight. We shall not be able to finish that. There are other matters that should come before us and it appears now that we should have some suggestion as to the procedure from the Committee on Procedure. I move that the Committee on Procedure be asked to make suggestions to us this afternoon at the opening session as to what procedure we shall take.

The motion was seconded.

George Warren Brown: I submit we have a motion before the house that was seconded, and if we have discussed the subject in general sufficiently I would ask for a vote on this motion and I ask for it to be a private vote.

David G. Downey: I move that we now adjourn.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried—19 to 17 on a division.

The benediction was pronounced by Bishop Cranston.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Joint Commission was called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Collins Denny.

Rev. John H. Goucher conducted the devotional exercises.

The hymn, "O Love that will not let me go," was sung.

The thirty-seventh Psalm was read.

Rev. J. H. Reynolds offered prayer.

The hymn, "Guide me, O thou great Jehovah," was sung.

The roll was called and the following were present: Bishops Collins Denny, E. D. Mouzon, Earl Cranston, J. W. Hamilton, W. F. McDowell, F. D. Leete, R. J. Cooke. Ministers: F. M. Thomas, W. J. Young, J. M. Moore, C. M. Bishop, E. B. Chappell, T. N. Ivey, A. F. Watkins, H. M. Du Bose, W. N. Ainsworth, A. J. Lamar, Edgar Blake, D. G. Downey, J. F. Goucher, R. E. Jones, A. J. Nast, Frank Neff, E. M. Randall, C. B. Spencer, J. J. Wallace, C. M. Stuart. Laymen: H. N. Snyder, R. S. Hyer, J. H. Reynolds, R. E. Blackwell, J. R. Pepper, E. C. Reeves, G. W. Brown, A. W. Harris, C. W. Kinne, I. G. Penn, Alex. Simpson, Jr., Rolla V. Watt, J. R. Joy, C. A. Pollock.

The minutes of the morning session were read, corrected, and approved.

Bishop Frederick D. Leete took the chair as presiding officer.

Bishop Denny: I have been asked to call a meeting of the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, but since that request has come the suggestion has also come that this meeting be postponed, so I am in a little doubt as to what the wish of the Commission is and I do not ascertain except to ask.

H. M. Du Bose: Is it not desired to hold separate meetings by your Commission also?

A. J. Lamar: I think it will be very necessary to have separate meetings before we vote on this question, but I think we had better discuss it a little further.

John F. Goucher: It is your privilege to have any meeting when you desire, whether our Commission desires it or not. And we have the same privilege.

Bishop Denny: This is not a matter of joint concession, but I take it it is agreeable to postpone that separate meeting and proceed here.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): We have before us?

Abram W. Harris: Dr. Stuart's substitute.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): Do you wish to have that read?

George Warren Brown: I would like to hear it read.

Dr. Stuart's substitute was read, as follows:

A Central Conference may be advanced to the status of a Jurisdictional General Conference under the following provisions:

1. A Central Conference may at any time apply to the General Conference for permission to organize itself into a Jurisdictional General Conference, and upon receiving a majority vote of two-thirds of the General Conference in favor of the application shall be so organized; or,

2. When any Central Conference has 600,000 members in full connection, the General Conference, through a Standing Committee on Jurisdictional Organization, composed of an equal number of representatives from the several Regional Conferences, together with ——— representatives from the Central Conference under consideration, shall consider and report upon the qualifications of said Central Conference for advancement to the status of a Jurisdictional General Conference. A favorable vote of three-fourths of said standing committee shall, without further action, advance said Central Conference to the status of a Jurisdictional General Conference.

Bishop McDowell: I wish to offer a substitute embodying the substance of the proposition I made this morning, and I trust that it will be considered as in substance and not as in final form, but that it will be considered just as it is without its technical relation to the different sections of the documents before us.

Bishop Leete: You practically move your proposition as a substitute?

Bishop McDowell: Yes.

Bishop Denny: There is already a substitute before us.

The Secretary: No; Dr. Stuart's was accepted by Mr. Brown.

Bishop McDowell: This is offered in substance and not in final form:

1. There shall be the following groups known as Central Conferences:

- (1) The Central Conference for Colored People.
- (2) The Central Conference for Europe.
- (3) The Central Conference for Latin America.
- (4) The Central Conference for Eastern Asia.
- (5) The Central Conference for Southern Asia.

2. Each Central Conference shall be represented in the General Conference as follows:

The Central Conference for Colored People, 12 delegates—six ministerial and six lay.

The Central Conference for Latin America, eight delegates—four ministerial and four lay.

The Central Conference for Europe, eight delegates—four ministerial and four lay.

The Central Conference for Eastern Asia, eight delegates—four ministerial and four lay.

The Central Conference for Latin America, eight delegates—four ministerial and four lay.

And two additional delegates for each 100,000 or two-thirds thereof up to 600,000. That would make a maximum of eighteen delegates for 600,000.

3. When any Central Conference shall have 600,000 members in full connection it shall by vote of the General Conference and Annual Conferences composing it decide whether it will continue to be a Central Conference without further increase in its representation in the General Conference or be erected into a Jurisdictional General Conference with the enlarged powers belonging thereto; and if it chooses the latter its representation thereafter in the General Conference shall be limited to ten delegates, five ministerial and five lay.

4. The General Conference shall have in each Jurisdictional Conference ten delegates, five of them being ministers and five being laymen.

The substitute was seconded.

Bishop McDowell: I do not care to add anything to what I said this morning about this. Anybody who heard the remarks made this morning understands why I am presenting them.

John M. Moore: I think we might as well see the situation as it is now. The Commission of the Church, South, as has been said before, accepted in principle, and we regarded it practically in fact, the report of the Committee of Eight. Of course we have accepted the amendments that have been made as they were made. That is about the position that we now hold. We really do not know about this amendment. We know that the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church has not accepted the report of the Committee of Eight as we did. We understand that thoroughly. Various proposals have come to us in the way of amendments, one by Mr. Brown, one by Dr. Stuart, and one by Bishop McDowell, and we do not know which is really the wish of the brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church Commission. I think if we knew that one or the other would be acceptable, or that your Commission had as a Commission suggested certain alterations in that plan offered by the Committee of Eight, we could more intelligently consider it or them. I do not know that we would accept it, but we could consider it; but as it is these various proposals that come up cannot be really considered by us unless we know that some of them meet the approval of the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church. That is the way I see it to-day. If we really knew what sort of alteration the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church would desire—that is, the least alteration that would be satisfactory to them—that would help us very much in determining whether or not we could go on and consider the matter.

Bishop McDowell: Mr. Simpson just suggested that there

is a vital defect in the small document I presented in that it does not provide that the General Conference and the Central Conference may erect before the Central Conferences reach the 600,000 members. I had no intention of disturbing that provision. I would hold to that provision, and what I offered was not intended as a substitute for that provision. With that understanding the matter is before you. Now, with reference to the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church this was offered wholly on my own initiative, and I do not know whether my brethren would accept it or whether they would not. I am perfectly willing they should say.

John M. Moore: What I really mean to say is, we would like to know the alteration that you really want and what are the least alterations you will be satisfied with, and if you can get that, we can go on with our consideration.

Abram W. Harris: What is the most you will do?

Rolla V. Watt: I think Dr. Moore is entirely right and the only way we can find out is to have a meeting of our Commission and tell them. I would be glad if you or Bishop McDowell would ask to have us excused so we may decide what we want.

Frank M. Thomas: I move you that the two Commissions meet in separate sessions and come together at four o'clock.

J. H. Reynolds: I rise to a point of privilege of the house before that motion is put. I do not know whether I am right in the point I am raising, but I would like to read a paper which I think concerns this matter:

Be it resolved, That the Editorial Committee of the Joint Commission is hereby instructed to state in its report of the work of the Joint Commission that in the course of the discussion of the status of the colored man in the reorganized Church, a report of a Special Committee of Eight was evolved, that for lack of time the Joint Commission did not reach a conclusion on the points involved, that it should state further what at the time of adjournment the Commissioners of the Church, South, appeared to be willing to accept and what the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church seemed to be ready to accept, and if the report is modified by a subsequent meeting of the Commissioners the same is to go before the respective General Conferences of the two Churches in its present tentative form.

If I can get a second, I will explain why I think that is a matter of privilege.

The motion was seconded.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): The matter is before us.

J. H. Reynolds: I think this is a matter of the privilege of the house, because I think it is apparent to most of us that within the short time allotted before adjournment we can hardly arrive at a common conclusion. This paper, if adopted, will call for separate meetings of the two Commissions to state just what

at this stage of the discussion when we adjourn we are ready to accept and not what we will be ready to accept a month or a year from now, but at this stage of the discussion; and let a statement of what the Commission of the Church, South, are willing to accept at this time and what the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church are willing at this time to accept, without any vote in the joint meeting, go out to the public in the communication to be issued by the Editorial Committee.

Bishop McDowell: I trust we will not vote on that just now, but take separate sessions and let this come up for consideration when we again come together.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): By common consent that can be done; but if Brother Reynolds presses it, it will have to be voted on now.

J. H. Reynolds: No, I will not press it.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): Then the motion to adjourn for thirty minutes in order to clarify our minds.

A recess was then taken for the separate Commissions to meet.

At the appointed time the Joint Commission again came together, being called to order by the Chairman, Bishop Frederick D. Leete.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): We are now ready to take up the matters before us. What is the pleasure of the body?

Bishop McDowell: We withdrew a moment ago in separate sessions in response to a request of Dr. Moore in behalf of the delegation from the Church, South, for an expression of opinion from the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church. I am directed by the Commission of that Church to say to the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, that we are prepared to accept the plan in substance as presented by me this morning, and as I now read it. I re-read with the understanding that this is to be the substance rather than the exact phraseology as to various parts:

1. There shall be the following groups known as Central Conferences:

And then follows the list, which I need not read again.

2. Each Central Conference shall be represented in the General Conference by—

And then follows the exact form that we have here. That the Central Conference having 100,000 members or less shall have four ministers and four laymen in the General Conference, and shall have one minister and one layman for each additional 100,000 up to 600,000, so that the present delegation would be

from the Central Conference for Colored People, 12; and from each of the others 8, and the maximum of 18.

3. When any Central Conference shall have 600,000 members in full connection, it shall choose by vote of the Central Conference and Annual Conferences composing it—its constitutional process—whether it shall continue to be a Central Conference without further increase in its representation in the Central Conference or be advanced to a Jurisdictional General Conference with the enlarged powers belonging thereto; and if it choose the latter, its representation thereafter in the General Conference shall be limited to ten delegates—five ministers and five laymen—without the right to vote except on connectional matters and such others as may affect them in their relation to the Church.

4. It is provided also that the General Conference shall be permitted to have in the Jurisdictional General Conference delegates not exceeding ten in number, five ministers and five laymen, without the right to vote except upon connectional matters under consideration in the Jurisdictional General Conference or on matters under consideration affecting the Church as a whole.

That is the substance of it, and I am asked to say to you brethren of the Commission of the Church, South, that we do accept this.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Will you state that that does not allow the provision about “may”?

Bishop McDowell: This does not allow the other provision in the preamble that, with the consent of the General Conference, a Jurisdictional General Conference may be created earlier than when the Central Conference reaches 600,000.

A. F. Watkins: I may have overlooked that, but what about that provision that if they decide to continue in their former state their delegation shall be ten?

Bishop McDowell: No, sir; that was not in it this morning. If they decide to remain a Central Conference, there shall be no further increase.

A. F. Watkins: I thought that went down to ten.

Bishop McDowell: No, the reduction is when they accept the Jurisdictional General Conference with enlarged powers, and the proposition is to prevent the increase beyond the representation which a Conference would be entitled to on the basis of 600,000, and that was to prevent the overwhelming delegation that might be reached if the members of any Central Conference should reach two or three million. If they choose to remain in the relation of a Central Conference, they do it without further increase in their representation.

A. J. Lamar: As I caught from the reading of this paper, I may be mistaken, but I assume my Brother Simpson understands it, that paper still stands on “may” instead of “shall.” You still present the side of the question that was presented by

Brother Simpson yesterday, and not the side represented by my reply. There is still the difference between "may" and "shall."

Bishop McDowell: Here is the difference, Dr. Lamar: "When, in accordance with this proposition, any Central Conference reaches 600,000, by constitutional process it shall itself elect whether it will be continued as a Central Conference without increase of its representation or be advanced to a Jurisdictional General Conference." That is equivalent to saying that when it reaches 600,000 members it may become a Jurisdictional General Conference. It gives the Central Conference the two options, but with certain modifications.

H. N. Snyder: It must take a referendum at that time.

Bishop McDowell: Yes. You understand, Dr. Lamar, when it reaches 600,000 it must take a referendum. This is not "may" now. It shall decide whether it will continue in one relation or take a new relation. That is not optional. It determines which it shall sustain by its own referendum.

A. J. Lamar: I think I understand it perfectly. I think it is just exactly where it was before, except under a different form of expression.

John F. Goucher: Now, what is the parliamentary status?

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): We are under the substitute of Bishop McDowell.

John F. Goucher: If the paper of Bishop McDowell is not accepted, we go back to the original proposition of the Committee of Eight?

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): The vote will have to be taken by the bodies separately; and if they are not adopted by both, they are not adopted. We are now at that point.

John F. Goucher: I thought we were going on to perfect our report tentatively as a Joint Commission, and then we could take separate actions on the details. The General Conference explicitly ordered that the Joint Commission should prepare a plan. Now, when the plan is prepared, I would think it was competent to determine as to whether each Commission would recommend it to its body, but the plan should be prepared by the Joint Commission and not by the separate Commissions. I ask for information.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): The Chair is not able to give the information, although the Chair individually thinks if the construction stated by Dr. Goucher is held on to it would prevent us from adopting anything unless we can adopt everything; which would be very unfortunate.

A. J. Lamar: I rise for the purpose of making a suggestion. I think the best way to proceed, now that we have heard the position of our brethren of the Methodist Episcopal Church,

is to let us have the action of the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): My attention is called to this rule No. 5: "No action of the Joint Commission shall be deemed valid unless by a majority vote of each Board or Commission." Operating under that rule, we have not raised the point of inquiry, because almost if not everything we have adopted has been adopted practically unanimously—that is, there was no large minority to call attention to this rule.

H. M. Du Bose: And they have been tentatively adopted.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): Yes, but so freely and generously that no action was necessary to be taken.

A. J. Lamar: What you referred to was the action of the Joint Commission, and now reference might be had to the action of the Saratoga General Conference, which said:

3. The Board of Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church is hereby authorized and instructed to appoint a Commission of twenty-five members—five bishops, ten ministers, and ten laymen—to confer with the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the Methodist Protestant Church, and other bodies in the United States, in elaborating and perfecting the tentative plan that has been proposed, and in carrying forward such negotiations as have for their purpose, and shall result in, the consummation of the proposed unification in accordance with the basic principles enunciated in the suggestions which were adopted by the Joint Commission and approved by the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Episcopal Church.

And both were instructed to appoint twenty-five members.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): The Chair believes we have been doing that up to this point, and that we are still on it.

A. J. Lamar: I call for the reading of the report of the action of the Commission for the M. E. Church, South.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): That is in order, I think.

Thereupon the report of the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was read as follows:

We are willing to accept and recommend for adoption by our General Conference the report of the Committee of Eight, with the following recommendation:

In case the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church does not consent to come into the reorganized Church as a part of the Central Conference comprising the colored membership, the Churches embraced in the territory now predominantly occupied by the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, shall be allowed to direct the contributions made by them for work among colored people to the aid of the Colored Methodist Church.

Secondly, we inform the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church that we shall be pleased to transmit to our General Conference any solution of the status of the negro membership which they may propose.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete) : What relation does that have?

Bishop McDowell : Our Commission went out to consider only the substitute that I had myself presented. Is this your action on that substitute?

Frank M. Thomas : It covers it.

Bishop McDowell : I wish that could be read again.

The paper was read, as requested.

A. J. Lamar : In addition to that, allow me to state, and I don't know whether my own Commission will sustain this or not : We took another action, and I think it would be well to put all the cards on the table and let the other action be read, too.

Frank M. Thomas : I will read it :

In case the Joint Commission does not accept the proposal of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, to stand upon the report of the Committee of Eight, we agree to transmit to our General Conference the two proposals—that is, the proposal of the Committee of Eight and the proposal you make—that they may be transmitted to our General Conference for action without recommendation.

Alex. Simpson, Jr. : It seems to be perfectly plain, in view of what has been done by the two Commissions in separate session, that it is quite idle to go along in the consideration of these further plans. Our time is exceedingly short, and I think it would be wise to perfect a plan as far as can be by considering the report of the Committee on Conferences and the report of the Committee on Judicial Council so that there can be eliminated everything except on those things that we disagree, and I move as a substitute for all before the house that we proceed to take up the report of the Committee on Conferences which has not yet been considered, and that to be followed by the report of the Committee on Judicial Council so far as it has not been considered.

Frank M. Thomas : I am not familiar with card games, although I am a Kentuckian, but there is another matter that we should transmit. We also decided that if a majority of each Commission should request it a meeting of the Joint Commission should be called before the coming General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

John F. Goucher : I offer a resolution.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete) : It seems to me we have about all we can handle before us. We have a substitute and apparently a substitute for the substitute before us. What more can we get in a parliamentary way except by common consent?

John F. Goucher : I can offer an amendment to the substitute, or by common consent I can offer anything else. This is with reference to whether we shall have an adjourned meeting, and we should settle that question.

Bishop Denny): It seems to me that in order to have some outlet for the resolution before us some action could be regarded as taken by the Joint Commission on some of these matters. I mean that the substitute offered by Bishop McDowell may be regarded as lost because it failed to receive the requisite vote of each Commission.

Abram W Harris: It has not been before the Joint Commission.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): If it is considered as having been presented to each Commission and rejected, the point is well taken.

Bishop Denny: I think the minutes will show that.

David G. Downey: How could it be acted upon by the Commissioners of the Church, South, when it only came in just now?

Bishop Denny: Substantially it was before us before we went out, as it was also before you.

David G. Downey: I think there was no intention that it should go before the other Commission for action. I should think in a parliamentary fashion neither of these—either the report of the Committee of Eight or this report—should be spoken of as having been before us and lost. The suggestion of Secretary Thomas is in line with what seems to be the proper thing to do, that the report of the Committee of Eight and the proposition submitted from the Methodist Episcopal Church through Bishop McDowell should go to the General Conferences without recommendation.

Bishop McDowell: I think the facts warrant me now in this statement that I distinctly object, under the circumstances, to the so-called report of the Committee of Eight going up as a report of the Joint Committee of Eight instead of going up to the General Conference as the preference or wish of the Commission of the Church, South. If we are going to send anything up to the General Conference, we should send up the proposition we have just now brought back as representing our preferences in the matter, and the report of the Committee of Eight as representing your preference, and that report should not go as the report of the Joint Committee.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): If I were called on for a ruling on that, my own conviction is that the action taken by the body of the Methodist Episcopal Church was to take the position of the report of the Committee of Eight.

John F Goucher: No.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): I am willing to be corrected, but my opinion is that both propositions are in the same position as not having been made in exact words—they didn't come to us that way from the Southern Church either, but in effect in

the same position. I shall, therefore, so rule as far as my understanding goes.

Bishop Denny: It must not be accepted as Bishop McDowell says. That is not the record. The record is distinct, that from Judge Rogers, one of the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, offered, as we were told, in his individual capacity, that is not as coming from the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, came this plan, and by him it was presented to this body and explained at large. By action of this Joint Commission that resolution was referred to a Committee of Eight consisting of four members from each Commission. That is part of our official action, and the report of that committee came back to this Joint Commission as a report from a committee appointed by the Joint Commission, and that report is part of the proceedings of this Joint Commission. Then the Joint Commission separated into two parts, each to consider the report of the Committee of Eight. The Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, brought in its report as agreeing to the report of the Committee of Eight. I have its action here if it is necessary.

David G. Downey: With an amendment.

Bishop Denny: With an amendment, and the Methodist Episcopal Commissioners brought in a conditional approval, which condition, however, was fulfilled by our action, and in connection with the report of the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church was given notice that any member of either Commission should be at liberty to propose by motion in the sessions of the Joint Commission any change which might be desired. Now, it is not a fact that this report of the Committee of Eight is the suggestion of the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Bishop McDowell: I do not say so.

Bishop Denny: It is the unanimous report of the committee appointed by this Joint Commission which came back to this Joint Commission for action by the Joint Commission, and the minutes must set all that forth. It must not be put in the light that we came here and made an offer of the report of the Committee of Eight which you rejected. That report of the Committee of Eight came to this body as the result of the action of this body, and the action of a committee appointed by this body and as the unanimous action of the Committee of Eight in which each Commission was represented by four members, and I make the point that the minutes must set forth those facts substantially as I have stated them, for I have practically summarized the action of this Joint Commission.

Rolla V. Watt: So far, so good; but we have acted upon a

good many of the sections of the report of the Committee of Eight. Now we come to where we disagree as to the details, and certainly only the points on which we disagree must be reported and on some of these we haven't voted and we don't know whether we will agree or disagree. Neither party wants to put the other in an unpleasant situation. We want this thing to be represented fairly according to the facts to both of our General Conferences.

Bishop Denny: Did I not represent the facts as they occurred?

Rolla V. Watt: We haven't finished that report of the Committee of Eight. We have agreed on some things, but we have struck three points upon which we do not agree. These three points should go up to the General Conferences and with the statement that we could not agree on them.

David G. Downey: I would agree perfectly with Bishop Denny's statement of the case up to and including the point where the report of the Committee of Eight was brought in, and that report was accepted in principle with the clear understanding that amendments could be offered. I think it should go up with the statement that the Commissioners of the Church, South, accepted that report with one amendment. We have now proposed other amendments, and it seems it should go up with our amendments in precisely the same way as it goes up with your amendment. Our amendments were, of course, more radical, but just the same they are amendments to the report of that Committee of Eight, which report came in here and is still under discussion. It has never been acted upon. Certain parts have been tentatively agreed to and there is an amendment to it proposed by you, and amendments by us, in the form of a report brought in by the committee from the Church, South.

Bishop Denny: I think that represents the facts.

E. B. Chappell: I was going to say substantially what Dr. Downey said, and what we want to do is to get this report with the amendments suggested by the two bodies before the two General Conferences, and I hope Dr. Blake has something that will accomplish it.

Edgar Blake: There is a privileged matter to which attention should be called. We are within an hour of the time fixed for adjournment. We ought to decide that we will extend the time of this meeting sufficiently to provide for the completion of these reports, or we ought to arrange for another meeting at the earliest convenient date. We ought not to leave the matter in quite the shape it is in now. There is no report yet completed. The report of the Committee on Judicial Council is nearest completion. The report of the Committee on Conferences has considerable in it yet to be cared for, this report of the Commit-

tee of Eight has to be perfected, there are sundry other items which should come to us from the Committee on General Reference, and certain miscellaneous matters also must be settled before we can make a complete report to the General Conference. I believe it is the desire of all the members of the two Commissions that we shall carry our work just as far as is possible so that we may present to our respective General Conferences as near a completed report as may be possible, that when our work is done no one will be able to say that the Commission broke up and didn't do its work. It seems to me that the suggestion already made on the floor of this Commission, that we complete our work as far as possible and then transmit that to the General Conferences, together with a statement of the items upon which we have not been able to reach an agreement, is a thing we ought to do. I believe Mr. Simpson's motion is entirely in the line of procedure that we ought to follow, whether we continue the meeting or whether we adjourn. The only thing I would suggest, if Mr. Simpson will permit me, is that his motion does not go far enough, in providing simply that we consider the report of the Committee on Other Conferences and the report of the Committee on Judicial Council. It would seem to be wise that we should complete a consideration of the report of the Committee of Eight, except the items upon which it appears to be desirable to postpone final action, and that we should also complete the two reports he has indicated and then those items in the report of the Committee on General Reference and sundry other things, and if Mr. Simpson will permit me to offer an amendment—I don't know whether it is in order or not.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): Not except by permission. Was Mr. Simpson's motion seconded?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I will accept Dr. Blake's amendment.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): Mr. Simpson has accepted your amendment.

Edgar Blake: My amendment is that the Joint Commission perfect the report in so far as it can, except upon those matters on which it may appear wise to postpone final action, the report of the Committee of Eight and the Committee on Conferences and the Committee on Judicial Council and such other matters as are necessary to complete the work of the Joint Commission, and that we transmit the same, together with the statement of the matters upon which we are unable to reach an agreement, to the respective General Conferences for their consideration and action.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I would be perfectly willing to accept that if we had time to do all those things, but I do think we can finish up the work of the Committee on Conferences and

on the Committee on Judicial Council, and I have no objection if there is time to take up the other reports mentioned; but the balance of the report of the Committee of Eight is so intertwined with things that we substantially cannot agree upon that it seems to me unwise to give it a preference as Dr. Blake's suggestion does do.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): Your motion would cover a good deal of action.

Edgar Blake: The motion offered by myself in this matter is a motion providing for an order of procedure from this time forward, whether we consider the matters at this session now or at an adjourned session. With reference to the report of the items of the Committee of Eight so far as I know, if we accept the principle of a Jurisdictional General Conference, if we agree that there shall be such, then so far as I know there is nothing in the section under "Members" or "Powers and Privileges," with the exception of Subsection 3, under "Powers and Privileges," that is contingent upon the method for determining how a Central Conference may become a Jurisdictional General Conference. It would be quite useless, Mr. Chairman, to send up to the General Conferences these three items on which we are not able to reach an agreement at this time without the other items. We shall have to reach the report or not send it up.

Bishop McDowell: I do not wish to delay action of the body upon matters upon which it wants to act. I only want it put as a matter of record that I desire to offer as a substitute for those features of the report of the Committee of Eight which were affected by it the paper I brought in.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): The Chair understood that to be your motion. We are now on the substitute of Mr. Simpson. Go ahead.

John M. Moore: I rise to move that when we adjourn we adjourn to meet in April, preferably the second week in April. I think there are numerous reasons for taking this action. The work as laid out by Dr. Blake is sufficient to keep us at least two or three days. We have before us this suggestion made by the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church—that is, it was really offered as an amendment to the report. The Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, can scarcely go apart in this hour and give that matter consideration, and then come back with any sort of a report that you could consider satisfactory. I believe the Church expects us to do our utmost to formulate this plan of unification, and we cannot do it now unless we extend this session two or three days; many of us are very tired, and some of us very sick and have been so for two

or three days. We have worked hard on these reports, and we have worn ourselves out trying to find a way through intricate problems. If we take six weeks of intervening time and think over what we have done, and what is proposed, we would come back able to perfect the various reports; and if we do not come to a conclusion and agreement on these three points concerning the Central and Jurisdictional Conferences we would be able to make them stand out and make a report to the General Conferences. In view of these various things, and in view of the fact that it is hardly possible to remain longer, I move that when we adjourn we adjourn to meet April 10.

John F. Goucher: I desire to offer a substitute or an amendment:

Resolved: 1. That when we adjourn we adjourn to meet at such time and place between April 20 and April 30 as after consultation shall be arranged for by the two Secretaries of this Joint Commission.

2. That the Committee of Conference be—

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): That is hardly parliamentary. We have a certain status here. Your first part is in parliamentary shape, but then you go on to something that is not in order.

John F. Goucher: Will you allow me to read it?

J. H. Reynolds: Let it be read as a matter of information at least.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): You can do anything by consent. Is consent given to the reading of this motion or substitute?

There was no objection.

John F. Goucher: (Reading):

Resolved: 2. That the Committee of Conference be, and it is hereby, instructed to prepare a form of report to be presented to the two General Conferences including the action taken and such other matters as may not have been acted upon. This draft of the report to be printed and sent out not later than April 1 to each member of the Joint Commission.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): The second part of that resolution is not in order.

John F. Goucher: Then it is withdrawn.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): The other part is.

A. J. Lamar: I rise to a point of order. We have already taken action in this Joint Commission which practically covers that point.

John F. Goucher: I thought I had five minutes to make remarks on this motion.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): You didn't have the floor on

the second part of the resolution, but you can have it on the first part.

John F. Goucher: Then my five minutes commence now. The point is, I suggest between the 20th and 30th; we place the time to be fixed by the Secretaries after consultation in order to avoid the unnecessary time in traveling backward and forward by the Commissioners of the Southern Church to the General Conference, and their expenses there. We might arrange to have our meeting and get through just a couple of days before the General Conference meets, and there could be a rest of a few days, and then go to the Conference. Considerable expenses might be saved.

John M. Moore: May I say that I chose this date, April 10, because I thought it could not be any later date than that. Seven days later than that would put us off the Southern Commission where we would be dealing with the work of our Boards: the Board of Missions, the Board of Education, the Board of Church Extension. Various bodies of our Church must be meeting in that period in order to make ready for the General Conference, and so I chose April 10, thinking that April 10 to 17 would give us the best time.

John F. Goucher: Was my amendment seconded?

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): I didn't hear it, but I suppose it was.

John F. Goucher: This is done solely for the convenience of the Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; but having heard from Brother Moore, I acknowledge my ignorance as to their convenience.

A. J. Lamar: I have learned from my experience in General Conferences always to be afraid of the last hour. A great many things are rushed through, hurriedly adopted without being understood, and we do more foolish things in the last hour of a General Conference than in all the rest of the General Conference. We are not going to accomplish anything here in this last hour, and I want to call attention to this fact, that by action of this body the committee has been appointed and the personnel of that committee named to publish not later than the 15th of March, if possible, everything that we have done here that would be of interest to the two Churches, and that same committee is to present what we have done to the General Conferences for their consideration, and in addition to that, it is to present the things on which we have fully agreed and then the things on which we have not agreed because of want of time for consideration. Now, I believe if we were to adjourn with things just as they are now, without acting on any other thing, it would save us leaving the question of unification hung up be-

tween heaven and earth. I do not think any damage will be done if we adjourn at the hour stated. I am opposed to this meeting at a stated time in April. In fact, I do not see that any good will come of any meeting at all in April. We will neglect our work at home, the men who are here. We will incur considerable expense for our Churches, and we will spend another week in talking over these same things and come out just where we are, judging from the past. We have now had three meetings, and we haven't done anything at all that was definite or, so far as lies within the powers of this Commission, conclusive. We have done several things tentatively, and then when they come up for conclusive adoption, as they will if you hold another meeting, you will have the same old fight you had over the tentative action. I do not see anything to be accomplished, and I see many disadvantages in that other meeting. Our Commission in its separate action—I think it was reported here—took what I think the wiser ground, and that is that if the majority of each Commission thought it was advisable at any time to have another meeting they should notify the Chairmen and the Chairmen should call it whenever it commended itself to a majority of the Commission. I shall therefore oppose Dr. Moore's motion.

Rolla V. Watt: I am in favor of Dr. Moore's motion that fixes the meeting on the 10th of April. There are four members of the Methodist Episcopal Commission that have to be in New York on the 17th. We must meet a week before that or a week after. I prefer the week before. I do not agree with Dr. Lamar that we haven't accomplished anything. I think the framework of unification is pretty well erected.

A. J. Lamar: Tentatively.

Rolla V. Watt: Some details not finished, but there is one report that is entirely done, except one little matter. If we adopt that one little matter, we will have that report signed, sealed, and delivered.

A. J. Lamar: I am willing to take that report up, because I don't think anything can hurt if we run right up to the hour of adjournment on that.

Rolla V. Watt: I agree with Dr. Lamar as to some doubt about the necessity of another meeting; but if we are going to have that other meeting, the date fixed by Dr. Moore suits me, or I would be perfectly willing to leave it to a later call.

Bishop Denny: The rules of the Commission cover the point. The Commission from our Church has already taken action on this matter. It will require a majority of the Methodist Episcopal Church Commissioners before another meeting of the Commission could be called. We took action as a body that when

the majority of our Commissioners agreed to another meeting, provided the majority of your Commissioners agreed to it, the two Chairmen should call it. I want to present that fact in connection with the order. Now, about another meeting: It will be very difficult to have another meeting. You mention the month of April. I take an interest in these meetings. Of course, I do not overestimate any value I have to the meeting, but I am just now shaving the edge of time, hoping to get away from here and get to three Conferences, one of which is in Mexico City. When I can get out of Mexico, I am not quite certain, but it may run me into April before I can get out of Mexico. That affects only one member of the Commission and need not affect the action so far as any other meeting is concerned, but this goes farther. The month of April, not simply two or three weeks in it, but the whole month of April will be taken up by a number of us in the preparation for the General Conference. There are matters I do not feel free to put into the record that make the coming meeting of the General Conference a very important one to us. Dr. Moore has made a statement about our other meetings, that we have had three meetings, and it has been difficult for us to come to any definite action. There is no prospect that if we hold another meeting between now and the General Conference we can come to any definite conclusion on these differences between us. If I were allowed to mark out the course that would be wiser, I think it would be better to go before the General Conference with the facts as they exist and present the facts, and let the General Conference give new instructions or more definite instructions concerning what we shall do and then we can accomplish something that will stand. But, in the present situation, I doubt whether another meeting would enable us to accomplish anything that will stand. I am opposed to the motion to adjourn for a meeting in April.

E. B. Chappell: I am just as busy as anybody could be, and I don't see how I could find time to attend another meeting, but it seems to me if we could have another meeting of two or three days to work some of these things out a little more completely it would be a great advantage in presenting this matter to our General Conference. We could come very much more nearly to doing what they sent us to do. Take this Committee on Judicial Council that Brother Simpson spoke of a while ago as being practically complete. Since that report was submitted, we have had another report establishing this Jurisdictional General Conference. That requires a rewriting of that report, so that we could not agree on that now. We could have that perfected in another meeting. I wish very much, if it is pos-

sible, that we could have a few more days together at any rate to perfect what we have before us in outline.

W. N. Ainsworth: I would insist that if further attention be given to this it should be done before we break up in Savannah. We must not have another meeting at any early day. I should be very glad if you would reconsider the action by which you determined to adjourn at six o'clock to-day, and that we could give one or two more days to this work.

Edgar Blake: The work that we have done is in such shape as to defy the ingenuity of man to make it intelligible to the General Conference, at least sufficiently for them to act intelligently upon the matter. In this matter of Jurisdictional General Conferences practically all of it is yet to be considered. We have adopted tentatively nearly all the Central Conferences, but there are as yet some matters to be considered. When we come to the report of the Committee on Conferences, there is yet to be considered the question of the Regional Conferences—that is to say, their boundaries and areas. There is yet to be considered one item concerning their powers. There is yet to be considered the question of the membership of the General Conference. There is yet to be considered at least one item concerning the powers of the General Conference. There is yet to be considered an item affecting the amendment to the Constitution. When we come to the report of the Judicial Council, I am not nearly so optimistic about that as my friend Mr. Watt. Dr. Chappell has already called attention to the fact that if we proceed with the consideration and approve all these Jurisdictional Conferences it will require a rewriting of the report on Judicial Council. Then the question of the name of the Church and the question of the General Rules of the Church—all that must be harmonized and sundry other items. I believe if we had three more days we could get through with all these matters. Personally, my preference would be to continue the meeting until we can finish these reports and get them in shape for presentation to the General Conference. Otherwise, we should meet early in April and complete this matter, for certainly, as the matter stands, it is not in shape that we could report to any General Conference.

Bishop Mouzon: It will be entirely impossible for me to continue in this session three days longer. Some of us have not been entirely well at any time during the meeting of this Commission in Savannah. We are too weary to attempt any work to-morrow or the next day or the day following. I do not agree with those who think we haven't done anything. It is true that whatsoever has been adopted has been adopted tentatively. It is true that some of us have been disappointed in not being able to bring anything to a final vote. But the framework of the

constitution which we have been working out here, I trust, will be the framework of the Constitution of the united Methodism. I believe it will. I believe we have been toiling at a document sure to be historic. I also am somewhat busy, but I am entirely willing to turn aside from some other engagements and give myself to the greatest task before American Methodists of to-day; and the greatest task before Evangelical Christianity to-day, the reorganization of American Methodism, and I stand ready to vote that when we adjourn we adjourn to meet on the 10th of April.

Bishop Denny: I rise to a point of order, that at the meeting in Baltimore we adopted some rules for procedure and among those rules published on page 17 of the proceedings of the Joint Commission held in Baltimore, January, 1917, is Rule No. 5: "No action of the Joint Commission shall be deemed valid unless by a majority of each Board of Commissioners." Report was made to this Joint Commission that the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, had agreed to a certain plan or possibility of future meetings, so that the motion of Dr. Moore would require a majority vote of the Commission of the Church, South, which would require a reconsideration of the action it has taken before it could be adopted by the Joint Commission.

David G. Downey: If a vote now were carried by a majority of each Commission, would not that meet your point?

Bishop Denny: I think they have to take the action separately.

David G. Downey: The action was that it could be called by a majority of each.

Bishop Denny: I don't object to have it go that way.

John F. Goucher: Could we have permission for the Commissions of the Methodist Episcopal Church to register by themselves as to whether a majority desire an adjourned meeting as suggested?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: Taking the vote of the delegation separately. These are the rules of the Joint Commission, not the separate Commissions.

John F. Goucher: Let us just stop a moment and take a vote. Might not the members of our Commission rise or vote by hand?

Edgar Blake: What was the form of the action of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South?

A. J. Lamar: On a call of the majority of the Commission the Chairman could call the Commission together for another meeting.

Bishop McDowell: It is perfectly clear that if a majority of both of these Commissions vote for Dr. Moore's motion that will carry it, and I move that we vote.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete) : That is a motion for the previous question.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

David G. Downey : Now, I move that a vote be taken by the separate Commissions.

A vote being taken in the Commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 13 voted for and 9 against.

Rev. A. J. Lamar desired to be recorded as voting in the negative.

The Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church voted 20 for and 1 against.

Frank M. Thomas : May I introduce a privileged resolution at this time?

David G. Downey : May I present an invitation? I have conferred with the representatives who live in and about New York, and they think it would be a very profitable thing if you would come to New York. Secretary Harris is there, too.

Charles A. Pollock : In behalf of the city of Fargo, the biggest little city in this country, I want to extend an invitation to you to meet there.

Claudius B. Spencer : It seems to me it would be advantageous from every point of view if the next meeting could be in Kansas City. I understand you are invited to meet in St. Louis, but when you come to Kansas City you come to a town that is strictly a border town and the two Methodisms are very evenly divided. I don't believe you could go to any place where you could see conditions much better than you could in Kansas City. You would have people come out to the mass meetings which would be organized in the evenings from Missouri, Kansas, and Arkansas and Iowa and Oklahoma, and I have no doubt the town is abundantly able to take care of you, and will be pleased to do so, and the impetus that will be given to unification would be very valuable.

Bishop McDowell : I am very sure we would do well to stop and consider the character of the next meeting. It will be a meeting for business all the time, and a long way, and no public functions and no social engagements, just steady, hard driving for as short a time as we can possibly get through, but sufficient time to complete our task, and every Commissioner ought to be in the same house. My judgment is that, all things considered, the place for us to go for this business is either St. Louis or Cincinnati.

E. B. Chappell : Or Louisville.

Bishop McDowell : With all due respect to Louisville, it is not as easy to reach Louisville as either of the other two places.

Louisville would take at least three extra hours for a good many of us.

Bishop Denny: You are mistaken: the train splits at Asheville.

Bishop McDowell: I think St. Louis or Cincinnati would be the place. Taking it all as a whole, one of those cities should be chosen. They are on the line of the best trains and there are trains there from everywhere.

Charles A. Pollock: So there is to Fargo.

Frank M. Thomas: May I say a word for Louisville?

Bishop McDowell: No, I move that we go to Louisville, by and by, to celebrate the reunion of the Churches; but for the next meeting of the Commission on Unification, that we extend an invitation to ourselves to St. Louis.

Albert J. Nast: I offer as a substitute Cincinnati.

John F. Goucher: I move that the Secretary be authorized and instructed to make arrangements for all to stop at the same hotel.

I. Garland Penn: I hope you will go to Cincinnati. I live there.

Frank M. Thomas: The Joint Commission has met in Cincinnati once or twice.

The Chairman (Bishop Leete): As the thing is pressed, I think I can treat Cincinnati as a substitute motion, but will take the motion simply between St. Louis and Cincinnati.

A vote being taken, 23 votes were cast for St. Louis and 17 for Cincinnati.

David G. Downey: I withdraw the invitation from New York.

Charles A. Pollock: The invitation from Fargo still stands.

Edgar Blake: I move that the Secretary be instructed to arrange with the new Statler Hotel which has been opened in St. Louis. Nothing better or more reasonable for service given can be had in this country, and I hope that the Secretary will make arrangements for all of us to stay there.

Frank M. Thomas: We will accept that. Now, I wish, on my own responsibility, to introduce this motion. You need not vote for it unless you feel like it:

The Joint Commission is agreed upon the following statements:

1. That American Methodism desires unification.
2. That the need of unification is large and becomes more imperative.
3. That there is a genuine and deepening love between the peoples of our two Churches.
4. That there is a growing understanding of each other's distinctive problems.
5. That it is the increasing duty of both of these Churches to consider more earnestly and to meet the needs of the colored people in the various Methodist bodies in this country.
6. That we are thankful to God, the Father, for the progress we have made in the solution of some of the great problems before us, and for that spirit of brotherly love in which we have been enabled to conduct our discussions and negotiations.

That the thanks of the Joint Commission are hereby extended to Dr. Ainsworth, the Methodist pastors and their congregations, to the pastor and people of the Independent Presbyterian Church for the use of their Parish House, and to the other pastors and Churches of Savannah for their noble and gracious Christian hospitality.

The motion was seconded by Judge Charles A. Pollock.

Bishop Cooke here took the chair as presiding officer.

Edgar Blake: I would suggest, if it is not there, that a paragraph be added that the opinion of the Joint Commission is that we are making very substantial progress.

Bishop McDowell: Yes, that our progress fully justifies our holding an extra meeting in the month of April.

A vote being taken, the amendment of Dr. Blake was agreed to; a further vote being taken, the motion of Dr. Thomas was agreed to.

Bishop Leete: I have a paper which I would like to present because I think we should meet certain conditions which have been created by reports unauthorized and fragmentary which have gone out over the country. I received a letter from Atlanta saying that some things have been published in the papers there not altogether fortunate. I do not know the source of these reports, and I think we should protect ourselves by passing some such resolution as I offer and publishing it broadcast. Here is my resolution:

The Commissioners of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and of the Methodist Episcopal Church desire these Churches to know that, in undertaking to perfect a plan of reorganization to be presented to their respective General Conferences, they have sought to carry out to the best of their ability, and fully, the instructions by which they were called to their task. They should not be held responsible for unauthorized reports of their labors. Nor do they wish any to receive credence who may assert that by their agreements they have bound or have attempted to bind Methodist people whose destinies are involved in their negotiations by any such engagements as do not permit of full discussion, amendment, acceptance, or rejection by their General Conferences.

Bishop McDowell: I move to add after the word "unauthorized" before the word "report" the word "fragmentary."

Bishop Leete: I will accept that.

A vote being taken, the resolution was agreed to.

A. J. Lamar: Two matters: We should instruct our Secretaries to pay something to the janitor who has waited on us, and we have cost this Presbyterian Church which has entertained us a good deal in the item of coal, and we ought to pay that coal bill.

W. N. Ainsworth: I beg to say that the local Methodists in Savannah will take care of all these local expenses.

A. J. Lamar: That does not include the janitor, and I move

that our Secretary be instructed to pay to the janitor for his services to us \$25.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Bishop McDowell: I wish to move that the Committee on Procedure prepare in advance of the meeting in April an Order of Procedure, so that we can promptly begin and systematically proceed to the consideration of such business as needs to be done.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Edwin M. Randall: I would like to inquire whether the motion proposed somewhat earlier, that a résumé of what we have done should be prepared and furnished to each Commissioner, was passed.

Bishop Cranston: That was in Dr. Lamar's motion, was it not?

Edwin M. Randall: And was it provided for?

Bishop Cranston: Yes.

A. J. Lamar: What is that?

Edwin M. Randall: That a statement of what has been done be prepared and sent to each Commissioner.

A. J. Lamar: And published not later than March 15.

Bishop McDowell: That was on the assumption that we were not going to have another meeting before the General Conference, and I think it would be well if that vote could be reconsidered, because this would throw out all the matter into the Churches on the 15th of March, and I don't think that should be done.

Bishop Denny: The point was that, as each of our General Conferences was to meet so soon afterwards, our people need to be informed of all these facts, and I must insist on the continuance of the resolution or the application of the resolution adopted by the Commission, because that was to cover that point. Now, you have put certain work on the Committee on Procedure, and I would like to call that Committee on Procedure to meet at three o'clock on the 9th of April in St. Louis at the Hotel Statler, where we are to be entertained. Those of you who are members of the Committee on Procedure will bear that in mind.

David G. Downey: I want to make a motion in regard to the publication of our proceedings. It is very important that we get the stenographic report before the next meeting, and I move that the Secretary be instructed to have the stenographic report, together with the minutes, prepared and printed and furnished at as early a day as practicable, and certainly not later than March 15.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Claudius B. Spencer: I want to make an inquiry about the report to the Associated Press to-morrow. The whole country will want to know and I am wondering if some provision could be made for some statement to be made somewhat officially.

Albert J. Nast: I suggest that the two resolutions of Dr. Thomas and Bishop Leete be given to the press.

Bishop Cranston: The Committee which was named under the resolution of Dr. Lamar, the Chairmen and the Secretaries and the other brethren, will please meet at the DeSoto Hotel to-morrow morning at 9:30.

Frank M. Thomas: That will be impossible, for some of us will have to leave to-night.

Bishop Cranston: How can we get together, then?

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I move a reconsideration of the vote so that nothing shall be furnished until after the next meeting of this Commission.

T. N. Ivey: I respectfully protest against that. Our people will demand something within a week or two after this meeting. I know something of the demands that have already been made. They are eagerly awaiting the time when they can be fully informed, and I trust no limitations except those which are absolutely necessary will be placed upon the matter to be given to our people. I hope that committee, if it has to stay here two days, will stay here and make that report.

R. E. Blackwell: I think what we have done this evening ought to go before the people at once. We want to know what they think about it. We may get light in the matter in that way, and if we keep it to ourselves until we meet again we won't know any more then than we know now. If we let the people know where we are, we may get additional light. I move that the Secretaries of this meeting, and no others, give a report to the Associated Press for immediate information to the public.

Secretary Harris: That does not include me. Secretary Thomas and I will be all that are left here.

Bishop Leete: We can trust you. We should avoid irresponsible reports of the final results here. Cannot Dr. Thomas and you take care of the Associated Press report?

Frank M. Thomas: I think we can do it.

Bishop Leete: Then, I move that the Secretaries, and no others, be authorized to give a report of this meeting to the Associated Press.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, and a vote being taken, the time of the session was extended.

Bishop Mouzon: The other day, upon motion made by Dr.

Lamar, a committee was appointed to put in proper form to give to the Church press and prepare for the General Conference a statement of what we had done. I wish now to move that this committee be authorized and instructed to prepare such a statement as they judge best to be given to the press at the earliest possible day. I am making this motion because I know our people have grown somewhat weary of this atmosphere of secrecy which has surrounded the meetings of this Joint Commission. Some of us have noticed that in some mysterious way some things that we have done have gotten out that nobody at all was responsible for. I am entirely willing to trust this committee to give to the press at the earliest practicable moment a statement of what has been done here.

The motion was seconded.

A. J. Lamar: To get this in proper form I will move a reconsideration of the vote by which we adopted that motion of mine. I was the mover of it.

Alex. Simpson, Jr.: I voted for it, and I second this motion to reconsider.

A vote being taken, the motion to reconsider was carried.

A. J. Lamar: Now, I make the motion suggested by Bishop Mouzon.

A. F. Watkins: What was that motion?

Bishop Mouzon: The motion I made was that the committee which was named the other day to give the press a statement of what was done here be authorized and instructed to give the press at the earliest possible moment such statement as they deem wise.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

R. E. Jones: I would suggest that the Church papers be furnished at as early a date as possible.

Bishop Cranston: After the meeting at Traverse City, perhaps also after the meeting at Baltimore, there were statements attributed to members of the Commission and some members of the Commission are editors of newspapers, and I suggest that the Commissioners do not allow themselves to become entangled with each other in statements as to what was done. If this is done, we shall not be in good shape for the meeting, and I suggest that the brethren restrain themselves and exercise care in regard to referring to our action here.

Edgar Blake: Then, I move that we put a lid on the newspapers.

James R. Joy: The only way to restrain an editor is for a publication to be made from an authorized source at the earliest possible moment.

Bishop Leete: I do not think we have done sufficient justice to the thoughtful care which we have received from Dr. Ainsworth, and I wish to call particular attention to the fact that at all times while he has been here as a Commissioner he has also been here as caretaker, anticipating our wants and providing for our needs and looking after the matters of detail so essential to our welfare, and I wish to personally express my appreciation, and I want to move a vote of thanks to Dr. Ainsworth for his painstaking care.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

W. N. Ainsworth: It has been my personal pleasure to put everything at my disposal at the disposal of this Commission during its sessions in Savannah. If you have lacked anything, it has been because I am stupid or because of inability to furnish it. The Methodism of Savannah has also had a great delight in entertaining you in this city, and I trust before the sessions of this Commission are entirely over the words spoken by our great leader, that my people may be one, shall come to pass.

Edgar Blake: I would like to suggest that the committee that is to prepare a statement to the Church be instructed to take these reports that we have been considering, which have been printed and considered in part and which have been amended and changed in various forms—that that committee be authorized to take those reports and put them in proper printed form for our convenient action when we meet in St. Louis.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

R. E. Blackwell: I want to say that I do not believe I have said once in this meeting that I love the negro.

The Chairman (Bishop Cooke): That is your privilege.

R. E. Blackwell: It is not a privilege, but a fact.

Bishop Mouzon: I wish to call a meeting of the Committee on Reference at ten o'clock, Tuesday morning, April 9.

Frank M. Thomas: I sincerely trust that this action in regard to publicity will not prevent the editors of this Commission from giving their interpretation of this meeting. I think the more publicity you give to our proceedings, the better. I think the people want the facts, and want them quickly, and I so move.

The motion was seconded and, being put to a vote, was carried.

Bishop Cranston: There seems to be a good deal of anxiety about this committee getting together. I understood that Brother Thomas and Bishop Denny could not be there, but the other members ought to get together and make a report.

Bishop Denny: I am not on that committee.

Bishop Cranston: Well, we will call a meeting of that committee for 9:30.

David G. Downey: I move that after the reading of the minutes and devotional exercises the Joint Commission stand adjourned until Wednesday morning, April 10.

Frank M. Thomas: If you decide to have a meeting in the morning, I will appoint Dr. Ainsworth to represent me in reference to the statement to be issued.

The motion of Dr. Downey being seconded, it was put to a vote and carried.

The minutes of this last session were read and approved.

The hymn, "All hail the power of Jesus' name," was sung, prayer was offered by Dr. Lamar, the benediction was pronounced by Bishop Hamilton, and the Joint Commission then adjourned.

